DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 118 243	PS 008 315
AUTHOR	Kamerman, Sheila B.
TITLE	Community Based Child Advocacy Projects: A Study in Evaluation.
INSTITUTION	Columbia Univ., New York, N.Y. School of Social Work.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Child Development (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
REPORT NO	OCD-CB-386
PUB DATE	4 Sep 73
NOTE	327p.; For other section of this two-part final report on the project, "Child Advocacy Methods and Techniques: An Evaluative Study," see PS 008 314; Occasional light print
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$18.07 Plus Postage
DESCRIPTORS	*Child Advocacy; *Community Programs; Evaluation Criteria; Evaluation Methods; Field Interviews; Financial Support; Organizational Effectiveness; *Program Development; *Program Effectiveness; *Program Evaluation
IDENTIFIERS	*Child Advocacy Research Project: Childrens Rights

ABSTRACT

This report describes a study of 23 community-based child advocacy projects, located in 14 states and 20 cities, and outlines a strategy for evaluating such projects. Data on each project's history, development, and current activities were obtained. Data were analyzed to (1) determine how such projects are started and become operational, (2) identify stages in project development, and (3) establish a strategy for evaluating each identified stage of development. From the analyses, an evaluation instrument for community-based child advocacy projects was developed and piloted on six of the 23 projects studied. Semi-structured interviews were conducted with staff at these six projects to determine the relative success of each child-advocacy project in terms of its planning and implementation. Variables such as funding agency, leadership, program structure, and advocacy objectives, processes, and targets were found to be important in program effectiveness. A review of evaluation research is included. (BRT)

Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original.

1-76

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED118243

Columbia University
in the City of New York

COMMUNITY BASED CHILD ADVOCACY PROJECTS: A STUDY IN EVALUATION

Sheila B. Kamerman

This monograph constitutes the final report on the project, "Community-Based Child Advocacy Projects", OCD-CB-386, submitted to Office of Child Development, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, September 4, 1973.

Child Advocacy Research Project

Columbia University School of Social Work

1973

PS008315

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter Page

I CHILD ADVOCACY 1

1. The State of the Art 3
2. The Need for Further Study and Evaluation 12
3. The Focus of this Study 15

II CHILD ADVOCACY, EVALUATION RESEARCH AND ORGANIZATIONAL DEVELOPMENT: A REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE 19

1. Evaluation Research 20
    a. The Current State of the Art and the Need for Evaluating Social Programs 20
    b. What Evaluation Research is and How it is Defined 24
    c. The Method of Choice: The Controlled Experiment; the Problems in Implementing this Design 30
    d. Other Problems of Current Evaluation Research 35
    e. The Need for Differential Evaluation 40
2. Organizational Theory as it Relates to Program Development and Change . 52
3. Other Relevant Literature 55

III STUDY METHOD: THE FIRST PHASE 62

1. General Scope, Approach and Purpose of the Study 62
2. Sample Composition, Size and Selection 64
3. Data Collection 67

Chapter Page

IV THE NATURAL HISTORY OF COMMUNITY-BASED CHILD ADVOCACY PROJECTS 72

  1. What do the Projects Look Like? . . . 73

    a. An Overview 73
    b. Where are the Projects Located? 74
    c. Who are the Consumers or Clients? 74
    d. Who Sponsors and Who Funds These Projects 75
    e. Who Determines Policy? 77
    f. Who are the Child Advocates? . . 78
    g. As of the Time of the Study, What do the Projects do and How do they do it? 79
    h. How Old are these Projects? . . 82

  2. The Life Histories of Community Child Advocacy Projects: An Overview 82
  3. Beginnings 89

    a. Where do the Ideas Originate? . 89
    b. How did these Projects Begin? . 90

  4. Getting a Child Advocacy Project Established 100
  5. Operations 113
  6. Summary 121

V PLANNING, INITIATION, IMPLEMENTATION, CONTINUITY: A CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK FOR PROJECT DEVELOPMENT 125

  1. Some Conceptual Frameworks for Organizational Development 126

    a. Planning 128
    b. Initiation 134
    c. Implementation 137
    d. Continuity 141

  2. Summary 142

Chapter Page

VI DEVELOPING AN INSTRUMENT FOR DIFFERENTIAL EVALUATION 144

1. Activities Characteristic of Eight "Failures" During the Planning and Initiation Phases 147
    - a. Non-Advocacy Projects 147
    - b. Projects with no Program 149
    - c. Projects in Difficulty 152

2. Indicia of Non-Advocacy 156
    - a. In the Planning Phase 156
    - b. In the Initiation Phase 157

3. Indicia of Difficulty at Each Phase . 157
    - a. In the Planning Phase 157
    - b. In the Initiation Phase 158

4. Activities Characteristic of Three Additional Projects Identified as "Failure" 162
    - a. In the Planning Phase 166
    - b. In the Initiation Phase 166

5. Activities Characteristic of Eight Projects Identified as Successful . 167
6. Activities Characteristic of Four Projects Identified as "Uncertain" 170

VII A FIRST ATTEMPT AT DIFFERENTIAL EVALUATION: THE FIELD TEST 176

1. Field Test Methodology and Design . . 176
    - a. Sample Size and Composition . . 178
    - b. Data Collection 180

2. Findings and Conclusions 181
    - a. Instrument Usability 181
    - b. Instrument Reliability and Project Changes over Time . . 186
    - c. Earlier Ratings' Predictive Validity 193
    - d. Additional Emergent Variables . 196

Chapter Page

VIII ADVOCACY REVISITED 200

1. Critique of the Method Employed in the Baseline Study 200

2. New Insights into Child Advocacy 203

a. The Role of the Funding Agency: Conflicting Guidelines and Directives 203
b. The Target Community 211
c. Advocacy Goals, Objectives and Targets 213
d. Advocacy Processes 217
e. Access and Advocacy 223
f. Advocacy Structures 224
g. Advocate Staff 225
h. Leadership 229
i. Boards: Structure and Function . . . 232
j. Sanction, Legitimacy and Accountability 236
k. Summary 239

IX REFLECTIONS 241

1. What Else has been Learned about Evaluating Child Advocacy Projects? 243

a. Analysis and Assessment of Proposals as the First Stage of Project Evaluation 243
b. The Second Stage for Evaluation: Project Initiation 245
c. Implementation Capacity as a Primary Focus for Evaluation 247
d. The Risks of Social Experimentation . 250
e. Some Thoughts about Outcome and Impact Criteria 254

2. Child Advocacy: A Final Look 255

Chapter Page

X APPENDIX

A. Community-Based Child Advocacy Projects Participating in Study . . 260

B. Letter Explaining Study to Project Directors 263

C. Interview Guide for Phasing-In Study 264

D. Instrument for Differential Evaluation 270

E. Memorandum to Field Representatives . 303

F. Excerpts from Instrument used for supplementary Study, Classification and Assessment of Child Advocacy Projects 305

XI BIBLIOGRAPHY 313

LIST OF TABLES

Table No. Page
1 92
2 115
3 159
4 160

CHAPTER I

CHILD ADVOCACY

In recent years, increasing emphasis has been placed on gauging the effectiveness of public and voluntary social welfare programs. The major social action programs of the last decade, as represented by Community Action Programs. Headstart, Model Cities, Neighborhood Service Centers, have been subjected to a variety of evaluations, in an effort at delineating their usefulness and results. The current Administration has taken a strongly critical position towards all social programs, suggesting that many have been found ineffective. At times, the pressure for information about effectiveness has led to efforts at evaluation prior to any precise delineation of the nature of the program or determination of clear-cut norms regarding program implementation, operations or activities.

Within the last few years, another social action program has emerged, albeit a modest one, and has been described as "child advocacy". There is urgent need to assess the relative merits of different child advocacy projects prior to any substantial investment[1]; thus, development of criteria for evaluation and an over-all strategy of evaluation are essential.

---

[1] There is much confusion, in the literature and in the field regarding the use of the terms "project" and "program". The clearest distinction is made by Joseph Wholey in his study of federal evaluation policy. He defines a federal

This study represents a modest beginning at this task. It is also hoped that through the approach to evaluation developed here for child advocacy projects, some additional perspective may be gained - some lessons learned - regarding evaluation of social action programs generally. But before the method and rationale of this study are delineated, and the particular approach taken is justified, it is necessary to explain something about child advocacy itself - what it is, how it developed - and describe the initial study on which this one builds and through which this researcher first became familiar with the phenomenon.

---

program as "the provision of federal funds and administrative direction to accomplish a prescribed set of objectives through the conduct of specified activities." A *project* is "the implementation level of a program - the level where resources are used to produce an end project that directly contributes to the objectives of the program." Joseph S. Wholey, et. al., *Federal Evaluation Policy*: Analyzing the Effects of Public Programs (Washington, D. C.; Urban Institute, 1971) p. 24.

Since many child advocacy projects describe themselves albeit inappropriately as "programs", it becomes difficult to maintain this distinction consistently. In addition, the term "program" is also used to describe the various *activities* of individual projects (advocacy, information and referral, counseling) or the implementation of over-all policy and guidelines when a project becomes operational.

Although there may be some inadvertent inconsistency, effort will be made in this study to use "project" when referring to an individual child advocacy organization or agency and "program" when referring to the cluster of activities provided in and by the project - what the project does. However, "program" may also be otherwise used when specifically employed by others or when referring generally to such things as "social action programs" or "social welfare programs," as in the above.

THE STATE OF THE ART

Needless to say, neither advocacy as a concept nor concern with the welfare of children generally, represents a new phenomenon. Yet somehow the term "child advocacy" has the "ring" of something new and different. Increasingly, both the concept and the practice have been mentioned as possible solutions to a wide range of problems concerning children. The concept has been used to highlight the inadequacy of our national commitment to children and the enormity of the problems faced by children in our society. Activities called child advocacy have been suggested as a means for identifying and publicizing the unmet needs of children, providing alternative ways for meeting these needs and stimulating public and political support for implementing them. A National Center on Child Advocacy, established in the Office of Child Development in May, 1971, was premised on the centrality of advocacy as an organizing principal for constructive action on behalf of children. In 1971-72, several federal agencies spent seven and one-half million dollars funding experiments, demonstrations and research under the general heading of "child advocacy". Still more projects were funded subsequently, by both public and voluntary agencies, at various governmental and non-governmental levels; additional ones are planned. State committees under a diversity of names have developed advocacy proposals and projects.

In response to what appeared to be an emerging movement, in 1971 the Office of Child Development decided to fund a one year research project at Columbia University School of Social Work, aimed at clarification of the concept and practice of child advocacy. The conclusions of this study are reported in the monograph, Child Advocacy, published in January, 1973.[1] The study included a review of the literature, interviews with key experts in the field, a broad-based mail survey of child advocacy projects and a series of case studies of selected projects in several categories. One objective was to determine whether or not the label "child advocacy" represented anything new and distinctive or was merely a new name for what had always gone on; a second, was to discover whether there was a cohesive theme underlying these diverse activities and whether it could be conceptualized.

We began our study by trying to discover when the term "child advocacy" was first used, and why. What were its immediate antecedents? Where did child advocacy stem from?

Three events in recent years appear to have precipitated current developments and represent the first general usage of the term: The establishment of the Office of Child Development in 1969, with its previously mentioned sub-unit the National Center on Child Advocacy; publication in 1969 of the Report of the Joint Commission on the Mental Health of Children; and the White House Conference on Children and Youth in 1970. These last two recommended the establishment of an elaborate hierarchical child advocacy system with operational units at various governmental levels ranging from neighborhood to national. Apparently influenced by this, several of the projects funded by the federal government represented an effort at initiating such a formal structure, beginning at the neighborhood or community level.

---

[1] Alfred J. Kahn, Sheila B. Kamerman and Brenda G. McGowan, Child Advocacy: Report of a National Baseline Study (New York: Columbia University School of Social Work, 1973). Much of the material included in this introductory chapter is derived from this report.

However, advocacy has a longer history. The origins of child advocacy are traceable to the tradition of social reform in this country: activities of the muckrakers in the late nineteenth century; the self-advocacy of women suffragettes in the late 19th and early 20th centuries; and the "child advocacy" of the first White House Conference on Children in 1909, resulting in the subsequent establishment of the Children's Bureau.

In its current manifestation, child advocacy is clearly influenced and shaped by the developments of the 1960s. The civil rights movement led to increased concern with legal and extra-legal rights. The anti-poverty programs - in particular, community action programs, neighborhood service centers, neighborhood legal services - contributed substantially to the form and substance of many child advocacy projects through concern with such problems as delinquency, school reform, legal rights and entitlements, qualitative and quantitative inadequacies in service delivery and citizen participation, in addition to poverty. Although self-help groups of handicapped people or parents of handicapped children began to organize during the 1950s, such organizations were initiated increasingly in the 1960s by ethnic and racial groups, or groups with shared problems (e.g., welfare rights).

Writers and professionals from a variety of disciplines emphasized the need for advocacy when working for the poor and powerless. Social work, in particular, borrowed the concept of client advocacy from the legal profession and used it to describe such a partisan role.[1] Others discussed the need to support the rights of children specifically.[1] Underlying the development of this advocacy role was the premise that the failure to receive needed service resulted from inadequacies in the service system, not in the client; thus, intervention and change were needed in those institutions serving the client, where previously there had been preoccupation with helping the client to adapt to the existing situation.

---

[1] Social workers wrote about the concept and practice of "advocacy" as being the support of the rights of the disadvantaged generally. See, for example, George A. Brager, "Advocacy and Political Behavior," *Social Work*, XIII, 2 (April 1968) 5-15; "Institutional Change: Perimeters of the Possible," *Social Work*, XII, 1 (January 1967) 59-69; Brager and Francis P. Purcell (eds.), *Community Action Against Poverty*, (New Haven, Conn.: College and University Press, 1967). Charles Grosser, "Community Development Programs Serving the Urban Poor," *Social Work*, X, 3 (July 1965) 15-21; Grosser and Edward V. Sparer, "Social Welfare and Social Justice," in Brager and Purcell, *op. cit.*, 292-301. Scott Briar, "The Current Crisis in Social Casework." *Social Work Practice*, Selected papers from the 94th annual forum of the National Conference on Social Welfare (New York: Columbia University Press, 1967) 19-33; "The Social Worker's Responsibility For The Civil Rights of Clients," *New Perspectives: The Berkeley Journal of Social Welfare*, I (Spring 1967) 89-92.

Lawyers emphasized the need for employing the advocacy role when working for the poor to help them realize legitimate rights in their relationships with large public institutions. See Edgar A. and Jean Camper Cahn, "War on Poverty: A Civilian Perspective." *Yale Law Journal*, LXXIII, 8 (July 1964) 1316-1341; Grosser and Sparer, *op. cit.*

Throughout all of the above, as well as related developments in advocacy planning, consumer advocacy and public interest law, there is a dual thrust: 1) an effort at achieving a greater measure of social justice for all; and 2) an attempt at ensuring some degree of accountability by public and voluntary institutions to those being serviced and/or the public at large. These themes underlie current developments in child advocacy also.

The 1972 study surveyed 116 child advocacy projects, 75 of which were visited for periods ranging from one-half day to two weeks.[2] By no means should these be construed as representing a complete picture of child advocacy projects, since more and more were identified in the course of the study. Furthermore, some of those labeled, when visited, showed little semblance of an advocacy function. This confusion and ambiguity were inevitable, since we were exploring an unknown domain. Yet, even considering these inconsistencies, some patterns emerged, and these are identified and summarized below.

---

[1] Bernard J. Coughlin, "The Rights of Children," Child Welfare, XLVII, 3 (March 1968) 133-142; Rebecca Smith, "For Every Child...A Commentary on Developments in Child Welfare 1962-1967," Child Welfare, XLVII, 3 (March 1968) pp. 125-132; the Presidents Task Force on Early Child Development, J. McV. Hunt, Chairman, "A Bill of Rights for Children." Washington, D. C. Office of the Secretary, Department of Health, Education and Welfare, 1967.

[2] Kahn, Kamerman, McGowan, op. cit., p. 36.

For the most part, projects are concerned with the needs of children and their families rather than children alone. A few, especially those with a youth focus, distinguish between the interests of children and their parents and may even note a conflict of interests. In general, projects are about equally divided between those which focus on the needs of a special group of children, and those which focus on the needs of all children. With regard to the latter group, most address the needs of poor and/or minority children, although some are concerned with special categories, such as delinquent or handicapped. A "universal" approach, with emphasis on children and families in greatest need, appropriately characterizes these projects.

Projects are urban, small scale and nationally distributed. They tend to cluster at either the state level, with state funding or at the community level with federal funding. Although tax-exempt foundations, voluntary agencies and self-help groups are actively involved in the organization of child advocacy projects, most of those identified are supported by public funds (federal, state, county) or at least by a combination of public and private financing.

In general, the advocacy activities or these projects can be classified as employing one of two distinct approaches which sometimes overlap: 1) case advocacy - changing, improving or assuring needed help for or service to individuals or families; 2) class advocacy - changing, improving or assuring needed help for or service to classes or groups of people. Child advocacy ranges, therefore, from direct services to social action. Although most projects stress one or the other of these approaches, some include both.

Although the study did not develop any formal typology of child advocacy projects, it did delineate certain variables, which, with further research, might provide the basis for such a classification scheme. For example, projects can be classified according to base of operations (federal, regional, state, county, city, neighborhood); auspice (public, voluntary or mixed); type of advocacy employed (case, class or both; lay, legal, or a combination); staff (**professional**, paraprofessional or volunteer; single or multi-discipline); role (specialized or general); leadership; entry point for advocacy intervention (case, survey, problem study, monitoring or regulatory service, self-help); target for change (the case, local service system, administrative agency, legislative body, court system); number of targets addressed (single or multiple).

Our initial explorations led us to conclude that the term often was a "gimmick", used merely to obtain funding and clearly not representing anything new or different. Certainly, the label was being used in a variety of ways to describe disparate and sometimes conflicting functions. Yet, gradually, as the study progressed - and as more projects were visited and more practitioners interviewed - our perspective changed. The final report, concluded that in spite of the gimmickry and confusion, the advocacy "movement" does have a distinctive quality and does represent a new approach to the needs of children.

As one facet of the burgeoning movement in public interest advocacy, child advocacy places particular emphasis on making child-serving agencies, institutions and systems more responsive to the rights and desires of their consumers. This approach distinguishes it from the more traditional child welfare programs, which attempt to enhance the development of children through intervention in the lives of children and/or their families. Within this context, child advocacy seems to represent a response to certain newly-identified societal needs of children and their families. Currently, children are seen as developing within a much broader social environment than their immediate families, although the family unit continues to represent the primary environment. Secondary institutions and groups, such as schools, child care facilities and institutions, are also seen as having substantial influence on children's lives and development. Thus, when problems arise, it may not be the child or his family whose behavior must be modified; instead, these institutions may require intervention, change or regulation. Proponents of this approach would extend societal responsibility to include concern for ensuring that institutions are appropriately responsive to children's needs; and child advocacy represents one attempt at developing a device for facilitating this.

Within this context, we adopted the following definition of child advocacy, later endorsed also by the Office of Child Development: "intervention on behalf of children in relation to those services and institutions impinging on their lives."[1] Included in this definition were activities such as the following: developing needed services where none existed previously; persisting in services where others might not; assuring access to services and entitlements; protecting new concepts of legal and extra-legal rights; mediating between children or families and such institutions as schools, health facilities, and courts; facilitating self-organization of parents or adolescents; changing policies, procedures, budgets, rules, laws.

In addition to defining the concept and delineating the parameters of child advocacy, the final report of the study identified those factors which appeared critical in the development and implementation of child advocacy projects and provided guidelines for a classification scheme to describe existing projects. It concluded with some discussion of the public policy implications of the child advocacy "movement" and possibilities for future project and program development.

---

[1] Kahn, Kamerman, McGowan, op. cit., Preface.

THE NEED FOR FURTHER STUDY AND EVALUATION

Although important variables in the development of child advocacy projects were identified, knowledge about the relationships between and among them remained imprecise and conclusions were at best tentative and preliminary. Most of the projects studied were only recently established and thus provided limited data. Confusion about the concept and practice of child advocacy as well as the time limitations of the study precluded more definitive findings. For the most part, project goals appeared to be general and diffuse. Knowledge about the alternative ways of structuring agencies to carry out advocacy, and of the auspices under which they might operate most effectively, was limited. Much conventional wisdom about such matters could be wrong. Methods, techniques and strategies were understudied and underdeveloped and little was known about the interrelationship of goals, structure, and processes. In short, the initial monograph had not exhausted the research challenge. Furthermore, the recent history of the phenomenon, the brief period of time most projects were in operation, the constraints and nature of the initial study, and the poor conceptualization of variables, did not permit any evaluative conclusions regarding efficacy of particular projects. Clearly, without greater specificity of goals than was achieved in most projects, no standards of performance or precise measures of effectiveness could be defined.

Although funding sources do lay down guidelines for projects and these may include a statement of goals, such goals are usually broad; on occasion, the guidelines are conflicting and are subject to change. As mentioned earlier, individual projects tend to be equally diffuse about their goals. Since funding sources may require evaluation from the very inception of the project, researchers are often compelled to study projects where no precise goals have been delineated, often before they are even operational. Consequently in an effort at clarifying objectives, evaluators often influence the selection of goals and thus the nature of the project and the program in order to delineate something measurable. Although some researchers view this as appropriate, it does tend to alter the program, inhibit innovation, restrict feedback, and on occasion, to frustrate project administrators. Pressure for premature evaluation has other unfortunate consequences, including the possibility of negating the worth of a project even before it is fully operational, as well as distorting the nature of the program. Occasionally, projects are further confounded by multiple evaluation studies: self-evaluation, the project's own plan for external evaluation, the funding agency's plans for independent evaluation.

The rapid proliferation of child advocacy projects prior to any widespread clarification of the concept or practice has resulted in a notable lack of consistency regarding project development and program implementation. Experiences on numerous site visits to child advocacy projects during the course of the initial study revealed that neither administrators, board members, service consumers nor outside reviewers have clear expectations regarding what projects should be doing after a specified period of time in operation. It is apparent that those responsible for funding, monitoring and evaluating projects, as well as those who would initiate them, do not as yet have access to systematic information about basic aspects of child advicacy projects. Inevitably, therefore, evaluation strategy is difficult to develop.

Finally, no completed evaluative studies of child advocacy were available at the time of the initial study and few creditable ones were in process. Of these, each was focused only on one project or on like projects in a specific funding cluster.[1] Thus, even though a recent report by the Urban Institute, one of the leading independent research institutes in the country, recommended jettisoning the single project evaluation study in favor of multi-project evaluations, among those evaluations of child advocacy underway, none was attempting a comparative evaluation study of different types of child advocacy projects.[1]

---

[1] For example, the OCD-funded study of seven Parent-Child Center - Advocacy Projects, by the Center for Community Research; the Bureau of the Educationally Handicapped - National Institute of Mental Health (BEH-NIMH) jointly funded study of six community-based child advocacy projects by Exotech-Mark Battle.

THE FOCUS OF THIS STUDY

This lack of basic information and systematically accumulated experience became the basis for the present study's point of departure: the need to seek out and identify what generally occurs in child advocacy projects after they have been funded as a basis for program and evaluation strategy. Constraints of budget, time and staff suggested the wisdom of limiting this focus further. The fact that community-based projects were the single largest operational unit - and were overwhelmingly predominant among those projects funded by the federal government - suggested concentration on this particular group.

After a period of reflection on the first study, an initial review of the literature, and some analysis of local project experience generally, the following preliminary study questions were listed:

1) How long does it take for projects to become operational?
2) Are there any identifiable patterns by which community-based child advocacy projects become operational?

---

[1] Wholey, et. al., Federal Evaluation Policy

3) Are there stages or phases within this process and if so, how may they be conceptualized?

4) What can be expected of a project after specified periods of time? What types of evaluative issues are relevant at given points?

5) What variables may account for differential development patterns among projects?

In short, the first and major focus of this study became the process by which community-based child advocacy projects become operational. Thus, the study is concerned, ultimately, with the timing and expectations appropriate to evaluation studies and reports and with the identification of guidelines that would permit more systematic experimentation in child advocacy.[1] Findings should assist future funders and project directors in planning, programming and project development. It was projected that once this information became available, the second major focus of this study could be an effort to evaluate these projects, concentrating on effects and effectiveness. According to our definition of child advocacy, projects address the needs of children and attempt to change, affect, or influence such institutional systems as the school, health and mental health services, public welfare departments, juvenile justice systems. For the purpose of this study, the "change" or intervention so identified may involve policies of other agencies, administrative procedures, staffing patterns, provision for monitoring of services and/or activities, the content of legislation. Evidence of such change, appropriate for evaluation, may range from action taken, services rendered and policies revised, to laws written and new programs initiated.

---

[1] For discussion of "systematic experimentation" see Alice Rivlin, Systematic Thinking for Social Action (Washington, D. C.: The Brookings Institution, 1971) pp. 86-119.

Within this context, the preliminary plan for the second phase of the study assumed that evaluation efforts would deal with such things as: the types of institutions or service systems addressed by child advocacy projects and an indication of which seemed most susceptible to change and why; the types of interventions employed, which are most effective and why; the implied criteria for successful intervention or change; indices and measures of success; and, finally, which of the various child advocacy projects would appear to be most effective for achieving change and why. Since none of the projects selected for study would be more than two and one-half years old at the onset of the study, conclusions regarding their achievements would necessarily be viewed as preliminary and tentative. The research design could do no more than place many of the findings in this phase on the level of hypotheses for further study. In fact, as will be seen subsequently, many of these questions proved to be premature for any child advocacy undertaking that is less than two and one-half years old.

All of this will be better understood within the context of some reference to the relevant literature. The next chapter will address this, before subsequent description of the study methodology.

CHAPTER II

CHILD ADVOCACY, EVALUATION RESEARCH AND ORGANIZATIONAL DEVELOPMENT: A REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Although considerable literature has developed around the subject of child advocacy, much of it is merely exhortation. Little substantive attention has been paid either to the process by which projects become operational or to various types of projects that have developed. To date the literature has consisted largely of discussions of the value of child advocacy,[1] critiques of the concept, approach and implications[2], discussions of differential conceptualizations,[3] and proposals for specific program models.[4] The substance of this literature has been thoroughly reviewed in the earlier monograph[5] and no further mention seems necessary here.

---

[1] Mary Kohler, "The Rights of Children: An Unexplored Constituency," Social Policy I, 6 (March-April 1971) 36-44.

[2] Jerome Cohen, "Advocacy and the Children's Crisis," American Journal of Orthopsychiatry XLI, 5 (October 1971) 807-08; Richard J. Gould, "Children's Rights: More Liberal Games," Social Policy I, 7 (July-August 1971) 50-52.

[3] David Cohen, "Politics and Research: Evaluation of Social Action Programs in Education," Carol H. Weiss, ed. Evaluating Action Programs (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc. 1972) pp. 137-165; Jane Knitzer, "Advocacy and the Children's Crisis," American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, XLI, 5 (October 1971) 799-806.

[4] Wilbert L. Lewis, "Child Advocacy and Ecological Planning," Mental Hygiene LIV, 4 (October 1970) 475-83; Wolf Wolfsenberger, "Toward Citizen Advocacy for the Handicapped," Lincoln, Nebraska, Nebraska Psychiatric Institute, University of Nebraska Medical Center. (Undated Mineographed)

[5] Kahn, Kamerman, McGowan, op. cit.

Other literature that has particular relevance for this study includes: 1) the substantial literature on principles, methods and illustrations of evaluation research; 2) some literature related to organizational growth and development; 3) a few studies of related social programs and policy issues; 4) evaluation studies of child advocacy projects in process. It is this literature that will be summarized and discussed in what follows.

EVALUATION RESEARCH

The Current State of the Art and the Need for Evaluating Social Programs

Although important developments in evaluation research occurred during World War II and immediately thereafter, the field as we know it today received its greatest impetus during the 1960s, as a result of the proliferation of social action programs established as part of the anti-poverty war.[1] Just as the experiences of the 1960s stimulated renewed concern with poverty, political powerlessness, social justice, individual rights, consumer and client accountability, similarly, the proliferation of large-scale, broad-aim social programming during that decade led to the need for evaluating its relative effectiveness for achieving desired social change. Evaluation research, long of secondary interest to professional researchers, received increasing attention in those years as the federal government sharply expanded its investment in such studies.[1] Currently, the extent of the federal government's commitment to evaluation research can be demonstrated by the number of such studies in process or completed within the last two years, and the dollar amount expended on them.[2] For example, in fiscal 1969 and 1970, OEO spent over $170 million on six consultation, evaluation, technical assistance and support contracts. Between the time that OEO was established in 1966 and the beginning of 1972, about $600 million was committed to such contracts. Included among these were 44 evaluations of a single program, Headstart.

---

[1] Robert Morris, ed., Encyclopedia of Social Work (New York: National Association of Social Workers, 1971), 16th Issue, II, pp. 1122-23.

One hundred and forty-six evaluations of HEW-funded poverty programs are either completed or in process.[3] Currently, according to a recent memorandum, the Department of Health, Education and Welfare is funding more than 130 evaluation studies at $25,000 or more, for a total cost of at least $15 million; the Department of Justice has 100 such studies costing about $8 million; OEO, the Office of

---

[1] For the history of evaluation research and its resurgence in the 60s, see Edward A. Suchman, Evaluative Research (New York: Russell Sage, 1967), Chapters I and II; and Francis G. Caro, "Evaluation Research: An Overview," in Francis G. Caro, ed., Readings in Evaluation Research (New York: Russell Sage, 1971).

[2] Establishing Priorities Among Programs Aiding the Poor, Hearing Before the Committee on Finance, United States Senate, Ninety-Second Congress, Second Session, February 15, 1972, p. 38.

[3] Ibid., pp. 186-201.

Education and the National Center for Health Services have respectively 25 studies for $2 million, 45 studies for $9 million, and 300 studies for $21 million.[1] Activities of private foundations such as Russell Sage reveal a similar pattern. According to its 1970-71 Annual Report, beginning in 1969, the foundation developed a program for improving the current state of evaluation research and increasing its utility for policy makers.[2] The Report specifies that studies of social change, such as evaluations of social action programs, deserve primary research attention. It states, "one reason for the increasing attention on evaluation is that surprisingly little is known about the actual conduct of most action programs and whether they have the intended impact. Moreover, competition is ever increasing for resources, both human and material, and often there is little basis for deciding intelligently where to allocate these recourses."[3]

Current literature clearly reveals the need and importance of evaluation studies of social action programs. The publication of three excellent readers on evaluation research within the past year attest to increased interest and concern with such studies, and with the field generally.[1] Essays in each stress the necessity and relevance of evaluation research for social policy, but comment equally on the inadequacies of avaliable research.[2] Similarly, the works of Suchman,[3] Rivlin,[4] Weiss,[5] Williams,[6] Freeman and Sherwood[7] all emphasize the same theme, although their perspectives on the interrelationship between policy and research may vary.

---

[1] Arlene Amidon and Orville G. Brim, Jr., Policy and Evaluation Research on Child Care Programs. Memorandum prepared for the Advisory Committee on Child Deveopment, National Research Council, National Academy of Sciences, 1972 (Mimeographed).

[2] Russell Sage Foundation Annual Report, 1970-71 (New York: Russell Sage, 1971), p. 32.

[3] Ibid., p. 31.

---

[1] Caro, *Readings*; Weiss, *Evaluating Action Programs*; Peter H. Rossi and Walter Williams, eds. *Evaluating Social Programs: Theory, Practice and Politics* (New York: Seminar Press, 1972). The above include collections of articles on the theories, practice, politics and utilization of evaluation research as well as illustrations of past and present work in the field.

[2] See especially the introductory essays in each volume.

[3] Edward A. Suahman, "Action for What? A Critique of Evaluative Research", in Weiss, *Evaluating Action Programs*, pp. 52-84; Suchman, "Evaluating Educational Programs", in Caro, *op. cit.*, pp. 43-48; Suchman, *Evaluative Research*.

[4] Rivlin, *op. cit.*

[5] Weiss, *Evaluating Action Programs*; Weiss, *Evaluation Research* (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1972).

[6] Walter Williams, *Social Policy Research and Analysis* (New York: American Elsevier Publishing Co., 1971); Rossi and Williams, *op. cit.*

[7] Howard E. Freeman and Clarence C. Sherwood, *Social Research and Social Policy* (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1970).

The relationship between social policy and social research is clearly recognized and has received growing emphasis. Professionals in both areas are working together more closely and both recognize the interrelationship between the two areas, although the problems of integrating the results of research into policy analysis and decision making is obviously complicated by the political context in which such decisions are made. Some of the current difficulties regarding the state of evaluation research are as much related to the politics of research as to research methodology, and discussions of the problems in the utilization of research findings abound in the literature.[1]

Despite the substantial commitment of the federal government to evaluative research, the enormous number of such studies recently completed or in process, the extensive discussions in the literature, and the consensus regarding its potential utility for influencing policy, the current state of the art is still largely inadequate and useful studies of social action programs are rare.

What Evaluation Research is and How it is Defined

Before proceeding with some discussion of the obstacles surrounding evaluation research, some clarification of what is meant by the term is essential. Current definitions of evaluation tend to involve a dual approach: the collection of information regarding program outcomes (and goal achievement) and judgments regarding the value of the program (and its goals). Suchman tends to stress the fact-finding aspect; however, even he insists that evaluation begins with a value, either implicit or explicit. He defines evaluation as

---

[1] See Rossi, "Evaluating Educational Programs", in Caro, op. cit.; Weiss, "The Politicalization of Evaluation Research", in Weiss, Evaluating Action Programs; Williams, Social Policy Research and Analysis for a discussion of the distinction between policy analysis and evaluation research; and Walter Williams and John W. Evans, "The Politics of Evaluation: The Case of Headstart", in Rossi and Williams, op. cit., pp. 249-264; Freeman and Sherwood, Social Research and Social Policy, (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1970).

> *the determination* (whether based on opinions, records, subjective or objective data) *of the results* (whether desirable or undesirable; transient or permanent; immediate or delayed) *attained by some activity* (whether a program, a part of a program, a drug or a therapy, an ongoing or one shot approach) designed to accomplish some valued goal or objective (whether ultimate, intermediate, or immediate, effort or performance, long or short range).[1]

In addition, he suggests five categories of criteria according to which the success or failure of a program may be evaluated.[2] 1) Effort (the quantity and quality of activity that takes place); 2) Performance (the results of effort, based on a precise delineation of objectives); 3) Adequacy of Performance (the degree to which effective performance satisfies the total need for it); 4) Efficiency (the degree to which the results are proportionate to the effort expended, e.g., costs); 5) Process (how and why the program works and effects are achieved).[3]

---

[1] Suchman, *Evaluation Research*, pp. 31-32. (emphasis author's)

[2] *Ibid.*, pp. 31-32.

[3] *Ibid.*, pp. 61-66.

Brooks also emphasizes the informational component, defining evaluation as

> 1) determination of the extent to which a program achieved its goals; 2) determination of the relative importance of the program key variables in bringing about the results observed ... 3) determination of the role played by program variables, as opposed to variables external to the program in bringing about the observed results...[1]

Similarly, Hyman and Wright define evaluation as "fact-finding about the results of planned social action"[2] while Greenberg states that evaluation is "the procedure by which programs are studied to ascertain their effectiveness in the fulfullment of goals."[3]

Although almost all researchers would agree that the purpose of evaluation research is to provide information for decision-making programs, some place greater stress on this facet than others. Emphasizing the relationship between research and policy, Weiss defines evaluation as "finding out how well action programs work...to discover information of importance to program practice and public policy."[4]

---

[1] Michael P. Brooks, "The Community Action Program as a Setting for Applied Research," Caro, op.cit., p. 57.

[2] Herbert H. Hyman and Charles R. Wright, "Evaluating Social Action Programs," Caro, op.cit., p. 185.

[3] B. G. Greenberg, "Evaluation of Social Programs," Caro, op.cit., p. 155.

[4] Carol H. Weiss, "Utilization of Evaluation: Toward Comparative Study," Weiss, Evaluating Action Programs, p. 323.

Alkin defines it as

> the process of ascertaining the decision areas of concern, selecting appropriate information, collecting and analyzing information in order to report summary data useful to decision makers in selecting among alternatives.[1]

Freeman and Sherwood state that

> evaluation provides the basis for the policy maker's decisions concerning the continuation, modification, expansion, or elimination of programs directed towards the amelioration of social ills.[2]

This approach involves two activities: assessing how well the program is carried out and measuring its impact.[3] Both Rossi and Williams stress the complementarity of policy analysis and evaluation, pointing up their distinctiveness and emphasizing that the effectiveness of a program is only one component of the ultimate judgment regarding its worth.[4]

Although most of the aforementioned researchers focus on the controlled experiment as the ideal design for evaluation, Cain and Hollister equate evaluation with cost/benefit analysis while others distinguish the approaches. Related to the distinction between policy analysis and research, however, is the distinction they make between a priori cost-benefit analysis (what Williams defines as policy analysis) and ex post analysis (what is generally defined as evaluation research.)[1]

---

[1] Marvin C. Alkin, "Evaluation Theory Development," in Weiss, Evaluating Action Programs, p. 107.

[2] Freeman and Sherwood, op. cit., p. 11.

[3] Ibid., p. 12.

[4] Rossi and Williams, op. cit., p. 16.

The judgmental aspect of evaluation research receives particular emphasis by Scriven, who defines it as a method consisting of "the gathering and combining of performance data with a weighted set of goal scales."[2] He insists that evaluation includes both the evaluation of goals as well as their achievement. Stake, too, states that evaluation must be both descriptive and judgmental,[3] while Ferman emphasizes this even more strongly, stating that

> "The primary interest in evaluation is not to arrive at certain findings, as in pure science, but rather to make judgements about the value of a technique, process or activity."[4]

The judgemental aspect receives greatest emphasis in Weiss and Rein's approach to evaluation which employs a qualitative rather than quantitative technique.[5] Such a method facilitates explicit inclusion of values, an approach that these researchers believe is particularly appropriate with regard to broad-aim programs.

---

[1] Glen G. Cain and Robinson G. Hollister, "The Methodology of Evaluating Social Action Programs," in Rossi and Williams, op.cit., pp. 110-137.

[2] Michael Scriven, "The Methodology of Evaluation," Weiss, Evaluation Action Programs, p.127.

[3] Robert E. Stake, "The Countenance of Educational Evaluation," in Weiss, Evaluating Action Programs, p. 35.

[4] Louis A. Ferman, "Some Perspectives on Evaluating Social Action Programs, The Annals of the American Academy, CCCLXXXV (September 1969) p. 153.

[5] Robert S. Weiss and Martin Rein, "The Evaluation of Broad-Aim Programs: Difficulties in Experimental Design and An Alternative," in Weiss, Evaluating Action Programs, pp.236-249.

Finally, Tripodi, Fellin and Epstein in their definition of evaluation, attempt to incorporate all three aspects; information gathering, judgment and policy.[1] According to them:

> Evaluation is the systematic accumulation of facts for providing information about the achievement of program requisites and goals relative to effects, effectiveness and efficiency within any stage of program development. The facts of evaluation may be obtained through a variety of relatively systematic techniques, and they are incorporated into some designated system of values for making decisions about social programs.[2]

In summary, although there may be variations in emphasis, evaluation research is defined as systematic fact-finding in order to assess the effort, efficacy, adequacy, process and efficiency of a program or system of intervention in order to determine its work or social utility, either alone or compared with alternative approaches. It includes concern with input, outcome and impact. Along with values and political feasibility, it is an essential ingredient of social policy, as well as being one way for judging the effectiveness of such policy. Ideally, it is an integral part of the planning process, both following program implementation as well as providing the basis for further planning, policy change and program refinement.[3]

---

[1] Tony Tripodi, Phillip Fellin and Irwin Epstein, Social Program Evaluation: Guidelines for Health, Education and Welfare Administrators (Itasca, Ill.: F. E. Peacock Publishers, 1971).

[2] Ibid., p. 12

[3] Alfred J. Kahn, Theory and Practice of Social Planning (New York: Russell Sage, 1969), pp. 323-373, stresses this approach to evaluation.

The Method of Choice: The Controlled Experiment; the Problems in Implementing This Design

Most researchers, in particular, Cain and Hollister, Freeman and Sherwood, Greenberg, Rivlin, Rossi and Williams, and Suchman would designate the controlled experiment, preferably classical Fisherian experiments (or at least quasi-experiments with impure control groups) as the method of choice for evaluation research.[1]

Rivlin, in her discussion of the need for evaluating the effectiveness of social programs, emphasizes the need for "systematic social experimentation" rather than what she would term the "random innovation" pattern by which child advocacy programs have developed.[2]

Regardless of their preference for rigorous design, without exception, all concur on the problems of implementing such studies. As is true in many other areas of endeavor, the theory meets obstacles when applied to real life situations.[3]

---

[1] In addition to the previously listed references, see Rossi, "Testing For Success and Failure in Social Action," in Rossi, Evaluating Social Programs, pp. 46-47 for his list of five distinct levels in the hierarchy of evaluation research design.

[2] Rivlin, op.cit. Cain and Hollister refer to this as "intentional experimentation." They also discuss "serial experimentation" - attempts at implementing alternative concepts simultaneously to learn not only that a particular concept failed but why it failed. See Cain and Hollister, op. cit., pp. 132-35.

[3] For a description of some of the obstacles to employing experimental designs in social action programs see Weiss, Evaluating Action Programs, pp. 7-11, 329-330; Amidon and Brim, op. cit.; Russell Sage, op. cit.; Rossi and Williams, op. cit., pp. 16-23; Weiss and Rein, in Weiss, op. cit.; Peter Marris and Martin Rein, Dilemmas of Social Reform: Poverty and Community Action in the United States (New York: Atherton Press, 1967) Chapter VIII, "Research," provides a general critique of research efforts in the anti-poverty programs.

First, all agree that the principal obstacle is that goals of social action programs are generally broad, diffuse, and multiple rather than specific, clear and limited. As Cain and Hollister state, the need to specify objectives is a principal tenet of evaluation research, but agreement in principle has not facilitated its implementation.[1] Rossi indicates that those programs designed to effect institutional change have the most difficulty in delineating specific goals, and find it almost impossible to employ experimental designs.[2] Such programs have no clear and simple criteria of success and benefit; without these, measures of effectiveness, or outcome measures, are impossible to determine, let alone quantify. Since this is overwhelmingly characteristic of child advocacy programs, it immediately precludes the establishment of an experimental design. Unless the researcher enters into the program at its inception and formulates goals, a situation which is recommended by some[3] but rejected by numerous others[4], such specificity is highly unlikely at the present time. Furthermore, since the programs addressed by this study have already been initiated, such an approach is not feasible even if it were desirable.

---

[1] Cain and Hollister, in Rossi and Williams, op.cit.,p.112.

[2] Rossi and Williams, op. cit., pp. 17-18.

[3] Freeman and Sherwood, op.cit.

[4] For example, Weiss and Rein, op. cit.

Second, when innovative social action programs were small-scale and circumscribed, evaluations were more easily designed. As programming became more national in scope, in particular, during the 1960s, the difficulties arose. As Weiss points out, "Programs may actually be no more standardized in form, content, and structure than they ever were, but they are funded from a common pot and bear a common name."[1] (For example, Community Action Programs, Headstart, Model Cities, legal services, neighborhood service centers.) For the most part, this too is true for community-based child advocacy programs, but it is further complicated by the fact that they are funded by several different agencies within HEW, under the same label but with disparate theoretical frameworks, goals, guidelines.

Third, evaluation involves people and programs in action. Randomization and the establishment of control groups are almost impossible in such situations. Furthermore, experimental, or even quasi-experimental designs imply a stabilized treatment or program. When dealing with a phenomenon such as child advocacy, where there has been no agreement as to concept, practice or goals, and where programs have only recently been established and are still in flux, volatility and fluidity are far more characteristic than stability. Community action programs, of which community-based child advocacy programs represent one form, are rarely simple entities. Weiss comments that such diffuse programs include a conglomeration of shifting activities that require enormous efforts to specify and describe.[1] Caro concurs, stating:

---

[1] Weiss, Evaluating Action Programs, p. 328.

> In these settings the evaluator must look for research strategies that are realistic and, at the same time, yield a maximum of useful information. Particularly in the case of completely innovative programs where evaluation results are needed at an early stage, informal research approaches usually associated with exploratory research may be most appropriate. Observational techniques and informal interviewing may provide more useful rapid feedback than can formal experimentation.[2]

Marris and Rein, among the earliest observers of social action programs, stressed the inherent conflict between an action program and rigorous research. Quoting from a report on evaluation of a youth training project, they note how impossible it is to be "inventive, flexible and expedient on the one hand and at the same time to do careful, scientific, controlled research on the other."[3]

In addition, traditional evaluation research assumes that the program is completed, something that is rarely characteristic of social action programs generally and certainly is not applicable to recently established child advocacy projects.

---

[1] Weiss, Evaluating Action Programs, p. 9. See also Brooks, op. cit.

[2] Caro, "Evaluation Research," in Caro, op.cit., p. 26.

[3] Marris and Rein, op. cit., p. 198. Rein, in the article written with Robert Weiss is the strongest critic of this approach and suggests an alternative which seems far more appropriate.

Fourth, practitioners are often antagonistic to evaluations, seeing them as a potential threat. (A frequent comment of project directors is, after all, "how often are there positive results from evaluation studies?") Project staff may be preoccupied with survival issues especially in the early months of operation, and evaluation of program outcomes seems unrelated to their immediate concern with continued existence. Even where staff are prepared to cooperate, they frequently do not see its relevance to their work. Short range feedback to improve programming is rarely provided by evaluators. Field experience reveals the frustrations of practitioners regarding elaborate studies which do not include reference to the daily problems of program operation. Even completed studies of relevant projects are often unavailable to practitioners and certainly not in a form which they can readily employ. It is generally agreed that evaluation research is designed for utility, but such utility should be for both the project administrators as well as the decision-makers. Decisions regarding over-all program worth are crucial, though difficult to achieve; interim decisions regarding program improvement may be equally important.[1]

---

[1] See Guba and Scriven vs. Rossi and Campbell in Weiss, Evaluating Action Programs, for contrasting positions on this issue.

Other Problems of Current Evaluation Research

Among the other criticisms of current research is the failure to study the process by which programs become operational, and how they interact with their environment.[1] In a recent report on the Parent Child Centers, Work comments on the lack of research focused both on process and organization of these and similar programs.[2] As pilot programs, they may be duplicated if their effectiveness is determined. He comments that "a greater understanding of how they have been organized, what should be done to improve them, and how the process of staff relations, staff-parent relations, staff-community relations, etc. can be carried out is essential."[3] In the course of visiting several of these centers and interviewing program directors and staff, Work made it a point to ask how they would advise people in a nearby neighborhood if they wished to set up a Parent Child Center. He claims that he could obtain no response and concluded therefore that intensive study of this developmental process is essential if any form of technical assistance is to be provided for new program development. Related to this he suggests study of the structural variables of these programs: staffing patterns and their relationship to effectiveness; the role of the Policy Advisory Council (every Parent-Child Center has one but its function is never clearly described and its real role varies and often is diffuse). He suggests further study of the role of participant groups in planning and the presence of such groups as a criterion variable.[1]

---

[1] Weiss and Rein, op. cit.

[2] Henry H. Work, "Parent-Child Centers: A Working Reappraisal", American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, XLII, 4 (July 1972) 582-595.

[3] Ibid., p. 590.

Regardless of whether evaluators favor the most rigorous form of controlled experiment or a softer design, all recognize that timing of evaluation studies is crucial.[2] Cain and Hollister comment on the pressure for evaluating innovative action programs almost at their inception. They indicate how unrealistic this is since it takes time for any program to become operational. They suggest that a "fair" evaluation of a program can only be undertaken about two years after inception. Only then can one begin to anticipate sufficient stability for evaluation purposes.[3]

Weiss also cautions evaluators and people who fund them, to avoid premature evaluation:

> New programs may fumble around searching for a rationale, a strategy of action, and procedures of operation for quite a while, before they settle on course. Because of initial confusion, evaluation from the onset is sometimes premature.

---

[1] Work criticizes the National Evaluation Study of Parent-Child Centers, completed in 1971 by Kirschner Associates, saying that "a major area of evaluation that is seemingly missing is a comparison of the various centers as to their function, organizations and process." p. 591.

[2] See Caro, "Evaluation Research," in Caro, op. cit., p. 23; Freeman and Sherwood, op. cit.; Hyman and Wright, op. cit.

[3] Cain and Hollister, op. cit., p. 131.

> In these cases it may be better to wait until it is clear what the program is.[1]

Shmelzer stresses that the problems of a new program are difficult to anticipate, and thus imply the need for an identifiable and accepted start-up period. As she says,

> Many projects learn that the time required for implementing the demonstration has been underestimated. Delays in recruiting and orienting staff, locating adequate facilities, and resolving initial operational problems affect program development.[2]

Considering the problems of evaluating programs with multiple goals, several researchers suggest evaluating particular elements or components rather than the total program. Weiss suggests that evaluators focus on one premise, one facet, one component, or one theory relative to a program.[3] Such an approach when applied to a range of programs can produce data of interest that would be useful for future program development. (This approach is particularly applicable to this study which plans to focus on evaluating the most distinctive aspect of child advocacy programs, not their direct services, but rather their efforts at intervention on behalf of children into those services or secondary institutions that impinge on their lives.)

---

[1] Weiss, Evaluating Action Programs, Footnote 2, p. 9.

[2] June L. Shmelzer, ed., Learning in Action (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1969), p. 2.

[3] Weiss, "Utilization of Evaluation," in Weiss, Evaluating Action Programs, p. 328.

Weiss and Rein also point out that the form assumed by broad-aim programs generally differs from community to community because of differences in the needs and tolerances of the communities.[1] Although this statement implies the impossibility of standardizing treatment, and thus represents an argument against more rigorous studies, it also highlights the need to delineate bases for comparison through comparative study.

Wholey, as mentioned earlier, recommends the elimination of single project evaluations in favor of multi-project studies.[2] Weiss says that if one purpose of evaluation research is to compare the relative effectiveness of different program strategies, comparative studies are essential. Furthermore, although planned variations in program development are preferable,

> comparative study, even without consensus and orderly variations, can have great power. If the evaluator is clever he can capitalize on variations that occur naturally. Many government programs...are not so much unitary programs as a congeries of diverse efforts addressed to the same problem. Within the program there are different emphases and different content and procedures.[3]

The evaluator may be able to categorize these different activities along a number of significant dimensions, relating program types to criteria.[1]

---

[1] Weiss and Rein, op. cit., p. 239.

[2] Wholey, op. cit.

[3] Carol H. Weiss, Evaluation Research, p. 81.

Amidon and Brim note that another problem with evaluation research at present is that often academicians undertaking such study "do research consistent with their theoretical and scholarly interests but not remotely evaluative of program goals."[2] Furthermore, they are often limited in their ability to carry out extensive field studies, because of insufficient familiarity with the field.

Ferman comments that good evaluation requires that the researchers have

> ...extensive mastery of the options for action that are available in a given substantive area, and must be able to reduce these options by the use of appropriate criteria. Many social scientists, although versed in research techniques, frequently lack the facility to make such judgments."[3]

Caro, too, stresses that personal familiarity with action settings enhances the evaluator's effectiveness in working with practitioners.

Finally, evaluation of social action programs has a particular proclivity for getting caught up in political conflicts. Methodology and design have become the ground on which political differences are exposed and resolved.[4] With so much at stake in both program and evaluation, it is no wonder that the results of research assume such importance. Yet considering the competitiveness for resources the demand for information about effectiveness continues unabated.

---

[1] Weiss, "The Politicization of Evaluation Research," in Weiss, Evaluating Action Programs, p. 333.

[2] Amidon and Brim, op. cit.

[3] Ferman, op. cit., p. 153.

[4] For an illustration of this, see Walter Williams and John W. Evans, "The Politics of Evaluation: The Case of Head Start," in Rossi and Williams, op. cit., pp. 249-264.

The Need for Differential Evaluation

Considering the haphazard development of child advocacy projects nationally, the lack of any consistent theoretical framework, the absence of clear or consistent goals, and the paucity of knowledge regarding processes or other criterion variables, the obstacles to evaluating such programs are almost overwhelming, yet the need is equally great. The problem is magnified by the fact that the projects were never designed as systematic experiments, but rather as random innovations. Thus the major problem for evaluating these projects arises out of the need for employing a methodology valid under these kinds of circumstances.

Although preference for experimental design for evaluation is overwhelming, and it is unquestionably considered the ideal design, the limitation and difficulties discussed earlier make such an approach clearly inapplicable to child advocacy projects. Most researchers recognize the need for supporting the kind of innovative programming these projects represent; at the same time, they recognize the difficulties such projects present for evaluation. There are several discussions in the literature regarding the need for differential approaches to evaluation, even among the staunchest supporters of controlled experiments. Rivlin, urging more systematic experimentation in social programming states:

> this is not an argument for less random innovation. Indeed, we need more of it. If we are to understand the healing process, there is no substitute for support of creative people who are permitted to follow where their interests lead them. Moreover, even in the applied stage, the initial development of new methods and models cannot usefully be systematized. Someone with a new idea about teaching or health service has to work it out on his own, in one place, modifying it and making it operational as he goes along.[1]

The issue, therefore, becomes how to evaluate the results of random experimentation, in order to proceed to more systematic experimentation.

Suchman, in his discussion of demonstration projects, argues that the state of knowledge regarding these goals and means for achieving these goals, requires a different design. He proposes that the research design be directly related to the different phases and needs in the life-cycle of a program. Classifying programs as "pilot", "model" and "prototype", he indicates that the variations are time-related, with the pilot program coming first. He describes the pilot program as representing "a trial and error period during which new approaches can be tried out on a rather flexible and easily revisable basis."[1] The emphasis in these programs should be on variation.

---

[1] Rivlin, op. cit., p. 90. Cain and Hollister stress the need for "intentional experiments" (like Rivlin's systematic experimentation) and like her criticize previous emphasis on natural and serial experimentation while recognizing its inevitability.

> Variation in the way the program is organized, in how and by whom it is carried out, where it is located, whom it reaches, etc. Flexibility, innovation, re-direction, reorganization are all desirable...Obviously, the pilot project requires "quick and easy" evaluation with primary emphasis upon the "feedback" of results for program changes. This does not mean that success or failure are not to be judged, but that the basis for such judgments need not depend upon rigorous experimental designs. This pilot stage is one of exploratory research and the main objective is to learn enough to be able to move ahead to the development of a program which can then be evaluated in a more systematic manner.[2]

Suchman suggests that surveys or case studies are the most appropriate design for this phase. The early developmental phase of all the projects included in this study, the specific inclusion of several demonstration projects and the analogous situation of several others (early efforts at innovation in programming, the limited knowledge regarding goals and processes) highlight the relevance of Suchman's approach.

---

[1] Suchman, "Action for What?" in Weiss, Evaluating Action Programs, p. 60.

[2] Ibid., pp. 60-61.

McDill suggests that where existing research does not show what works and what does not work, evaluation research needs to learn from innovative projects that appear to have been successful.[1] The authors recommend that locally-based projects be funded and staffed with project directors "who might be long on ideas and experience but short on methods for justifying the ideas."[2] They argue that there is a high level of risk involved in such programming, but assume that through this "trial and error" approach to experimentation, successful projects could be identified and then subjected to more rigorous study. Along these lines they recommend a triple approach to project development: 1) a small group of experimental projects, rigorously studied; 2) a small group of high risk projects, initially free of rigorous evaluation; and 3) a large majority of projects somewhere in the middle, whose evaluation would vary depending on the nature of the project; such an approach would include field studies, ex post facto design, longitudinal studies.[3]

Rossi points out that while controlled experiments are the most powerful devices available for evaluation research, they are often difficult to implement in the context of action programs, for the reasons mentioned earlier. He states that such an approach is more feasible for specific aim programs because

---

[1] Edward L. McDill, Mary S. McDill and J. Timothy Sprehe, "Evaluation in Practice: Compensatory Education," in Rossi and Williams, op. cit., pp. 141-185.

[2] Ibid., p. 181.

[3] Although McDill, et al address the need for a variety of approaches to compensatory education, their approach has relevance for social action programs generally. See chart on page 181.

> the more specific the goal of the program, the more consensus there will be among decision makers, researchers, and program administrators, in the measures that can be taken as signs of the failure or success of the program.[1]

Thus rigorous evaluation of OEO family planning programs can be implemented because the reduction of births in the target population is a clear, specific agreed upon and measurable outcome. He comments further that where broad-aim programs are concerned (e.g., anti-poverty, Headstart, child advocacy) program "monitoring" becomes the "first step in a graded series of vested researches."[2] Once the more effective programs have been identified, more rigorous techniques can be employed. He concludes by saying that "at this point it seems utopian to expect that we will ever have experimental designs measuring the impact of Title I programs or Model Cities."[3] He delineates two phases in the development of a useful strategy for evaluation research. First a "reconnaissance phase" - a rough screening process in which a soft research design identifies specific projects and/or types of programs worth further investigation, and second, an "experimental phase" in which powerful controlled experiments are used to evaluate the effectiveness of those programs already demonstrated as worthwhile.[1]

---

[1] Rossi, Rossi and Williams, op. cit., p.44.

[2] Ibid., p. 44.

[3] Ibid., p. 44.

Both Suchman's concept of relating the research design to the phases in the life cycle of a project, and Rossi's dual strategy of evaluation - with "soft" approaches employed when evaluating broad-aim programs - have particular relevance for this study. However, further delineation of the methodology to be employed follows from the stance taken by Weiss and Rein. Recognizing the utility of experimental design for specific aim programs, they are strongly critical of the approach when applied to broad aim programs. They argue that the multiple objectives, strategies and evolving nature of such programs require a process-oriented, qualitative and historical approach to evaluation.

They focus on the need to understand the process of development, adaptation and effect. Instead of emphasizing whether or not a program works, they stress the need to discuss what happens when such a program is introduced. They outline a more effective methodology as follows:

---

[1] Peter H. Rossi, "Practice, Method, and Theory in Evaluating Social Action Programs," On Fighting Poverty, ed. by James L. Sundquist (New York: Basic Books, 1969), p. 232.

> First, a more effective methodology would be much more descriptive and inductive. It would be concerned with describing the unfolding form of the experimental intervention, the reactions of individuals and institutions subjected to its impact, and the consequences, so far as they can be learned by interview and observation, for these individuals and institutions. It would lean toward the use of field methodology, emphasizing interview and observation, though it would not be restricted to this. But it would be much more concerned with learning than with measuring.[1]

They characterize this methodology for evaluating broad-aim programs as

a) process oriented qualitative research as
b) historical research, or a
c) case study or comparative research[2]

Although Weiss and Rein recommend either an individual case study or a small-scale comparative study, a variation on this approach, combining a process orientation and Rossi's concept of "monitoring" - but stressing comparative study - has already been implemented by OEO.[3]

---

[1] Weiss and Rein in Caro, op. cit., p. 295.

[2] Weiss and Rein in Weiss, Evaluating Action Programs, p. 243. One current evaluation employing the approach is Kaplan, Gans and Kahn's study of service integration projects. This study is still in process. It was hoped that some intermediate reports would be available for analysis as to its relevance for this study, however, no reports were forthcoming thus far.

[3] Employing field interviews, observations, etc., this study, directed by Vanecko, compares 50 community action programs classifying them into those which emphasized citizen organization (organizing and mobilizing the poor) and those which emphasized the coordination of existing agencies and services. Vanecko concluded that the former produced more in the way of increased services for clients than the latter. J. J. Vanecko, "Community Mobilization and Institutional Change," Social Science Quarterly, L, 3 (1969).

Rossi, Weiss and Rein relate the need for differential approaches for evaluation to the type of program as determined by the nature of the program goals (specified aim vs. broad-aim programs). Suchman relates his method to this, as well as to the stage in the life cycle of a program. However, he implies that programs are discrete entities, representing each phase in the cycle (e.g., pilot, model or prototype program). Alkin, Freeman and Sherwood focus on the planning process which leads to making programs operational. For example, Alkin identifies five types of evaluations related to attempts at providing information for different kinds or levels of decision making.[1]

1) systems assessment (this involves a kind of exploration phase and delineation of the tasks to be addressed, problem to be solved, goals to be achieved)

2) program planning (consisting of information gathering relevant to the selection of alternative programs or strategies)

3) program implementation (this consists of providing information relative to the extent to which a program is doing what it proposed to do (and/or says it is doing) to the group for which it was intended

4) program improvement (the feedback of information to the program to correct errors or effect some change in it)

5) program certification (providing information that might be used by decision-makers in making judgments about the worth of a program, and its potential generalizability to other related situations)

---

[1] Although Alkin is concerned with education, his approach is equally applicable to other types of action programs. Alkin, in Weiss, Evaluating Action Programs, p. 109.

Although Freeman and Sherwood are among the most ardent supporters of rigorous experimental research, their delineation of the different tasks faced by program implies the need for differential evaluation related to these tasks. They sub-divide the work of a project into planning, development, and execution, with evaluation occurring only at the end. They acknowledge that separation of these tasks is somewhat arbitrary and artificial and that there is a level of interdependence between and among them yet state that evaluation "cannot take place when planning and program development have not been thoroughly undertaken."[1] They delineate the tasks to include:

1) Planning (setting goals, assessing existing conditions, developing strategy).
2) Program development and implementation (selecting target population or targets, target area, and designating a program model).
3) Evaluation.

Implicit in the above is that if evaluation is to occur after the appropriate tasks are completed, some ordering and timing of these tasks are essential; assumptions regarding the completion of these tasks should be based on collected information; evaluation that is performed at the planning stage would have to involve different criteria (and methodology?) than evaluation after the program implementation is completed.[2]

---

[1] Freeman and Sherwood, op. cit., p. 83.

[2] Ibid., pp. 3-15.

Wholey delineates four types of evaluation:[1]

1) program impact (assessment of the over-all effectiveness of a national program in achieving its objective, or of a small group of programs, in meeting their common objectives);
2) program strategy (assessment of the relative effectiveness of different techniques used in a national program);
3) project evaluation (assessment of the effectiveness of an individual project in achieving its stated objectives);
4) project rating (assessment of the relative effectiveness of different local projects in achieving program objectives);
5) monitoring (as distinct from evaluation, assesses the managerial and operational efficiency of programs and focuses on inputs rather than outcomes).

Wholey urges that the federal government no longer commit itself to evaluating individual projects, but rather concentrate on national programs with multiple projects, or at least a group of projects. He urges the collection and analysis of data on comparable programs and suggests that if local evaluations are required of local projects, the government provide funds and technical assistance to implement such studies.

Glennan describes three types of evaluation research, as defined in the OEO instruction manual:[2]

---

[1] Wholey, et al, op. cit., pp. 25-27.

[2] Thomas K. Glennan, Jr.,"Evaluating Federal Manpower Programs: Notes and Observations", Rossi and Williams, op.cit. pp. 187-220.

Type 1:
The over-all assessment of the impact and effectiveness of a national program, in order to determine the allocation of resources and implement planning. For the most part these should be cost/benefit studies, done by the federal government.

Type II:
Evaluation done for immediate feedback; it relates to the identification of differentially effective program strategies.

Type III:
Monitoring

Although Glennan does not use the terminology "summative" and "formative" evaluations, his description of Types I and II closely resemble these categories, as they are defined by McDill:

> Summative (assessing the impact of the program at the global level); formative (focusing on local efforts to isolate effective strategies which could be used to improve national efforts); and monitoring (periodic "custodial" assessments of local programs to determine that minimum federal guidelines were being followed .[1]

Relevant to this distinction between summative and formative evaluation, both Glennan and McDill criticize the Westinghouse Headstart Evaluation for focusing solely on the global impact of the program at the national level rather than on the differential effectiveness of local centers. The importance of formative evaluation studies is also discussed by Stake, who relates this to studying the early developmental stage of project development, and stresses the importance of this for planners and programmers.

---

[1] McDill, Rossi and Williams, op. cit., p. 164, Footnote.

Scriven, who appears to have been the first to note this distinction between formative and summative evaluation states that evaluating stable and fully operational programs is very different from evaluating newly established programs that are still in flux.[1] He suggests that formative evaluation is designed for the latter group to help them improve and aid development, while summative evaluation is designed to appraise a well-established program. He concludes that different research designs, measures and time schedules are required for each type.

Finally, another approach to differential evaluation, that of Tripodi, Fellin and Epstein, is particularly relevant to this study.[2] The authors identify three stages of program development:

1) Program initiation, the first phase of program development, refers to the whole planning process and consists of determining the need for the program, specifying goals, processes, structure and strategies; identifying targets; obtaining funds; hiring staff.

2) Program contact involves the development of constituencies and target populations and/or organizations; identifying aids or obstacles to the implementation of a program.

3) Program implementation is the final stage of program development and implies that the program is fully operational. In this stage, services are provided and interventions or change technology applied. It is only at this stage that program outcomes can be identified and measured.

---

[1] Scriven in Weiss, op. cit.

[2] Tripodi, Fellin and Epstein, op. cit., Chapter II, "Program Development", pp. 25-40.

Basic to their approach to evaluation is a strategy of differential evaluation which they define as:

> a process of asking different evaluation questions of program efforts, effectiveness and efficiency for each program stage of development, and then choosing those evaluation techniques which are most appropriate to the evaluation objectives.[1]

Their recognition of developmental stages in the life cycle of social action programs, and the explicit design of differential criteria for each of these phases, seems particularly relevant for this study.

ORGANIZATIONAL THEORY AS IT RELATES TO PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT AND CHANGE

The case for a differential approach to evaluation has been argued; the issue now is how to delineate the stages by which a project develops, in order to seek out and identify evaluative criteria for each stage. Considering the fact that child advocacy projects appear to be addressing a newly defined need, that of intervention in institutions impinging on children's lives, they tend to be new and at least in part, innovative. Systematic knowledge about how they are initiated, develop and become operational does not yet exist. Thus, the process must be first studied empirically, relevant data collected and analyzed, before any developmental stages are positively identified.

However, while they employ different vocabularies and degress of refinement, there are several studies of organizational development and change that offer possible frameworks for viewing this process and some guidelines for conceptualizing it. Although in practice there may be some interconnection and overlap, these stages tend to be defined as discrete, in order to provide analytic categories within which one can approach a study of the developmental process.

---

[1] *Ibid*., p. 12.

Two such conceptualizations seem particularly useful for the purpose of this study. The first, that of Lawrence and Lorsch, suggest five stages of organizational development:[1]

1) Diagnosis, involves identification and analysis of the problem or need and includes organizational, environmental and related factors;

2) Design includes the establishment of an organizational structure and delineating objectives;

3) Action-Planning involves the development of alternative strategies and change methods for achieving the desired objectives as well as planning the sequence and timing of action steps;

4) Implementation is the phase in which the action plan is translated into action;

5) Evaluation is both the last step in the organizational development sequence and the first phase of a new cycle. It consists, again, of comparing planned goals with actual results and diagnosing the variance of its causes.

Hage and Aiken identify four phases in program development: Evaluation, Initiation, Implementation and Routinization.[2]

---

[1] Paul R. Lawrence and Jay W. Lorsch, Developing Organizations: Diagnosis and Action (Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co., 1969), p. 21.

[2] Jerold Hage and Michael Aiken, Social Change in Complex Organizations (New York: Random House, 1970), pp. 92-106.

They employ the term "evaluation" to describe the process by which a situation, problem or need is studied, diagnosed and assessed. In effect, what is the need for change? What are the objectives? (Lawrence and Lorsch actually do the same when they employ evaluation as the final phase in the developmental cycle; it is also the first phase of a possible new cycle, for example, initiating a new program if a new need or problem arises).

The second stage, initiation, involves designing the new program. It includes a search for solutions to the problem or need identified, the preferred choice among alternative solutions, and the search for resources, both financial and human to pay for the proposed plan.

The third stage, implementation, involves the actual attempt to start a new activity. Here, the change plan that has been designed and developed in stage two, is put into action; the program becomes operational.

Finally, the fourth stage is that of routinization, and involves the stabilization of the program. This implies achievement of objectives, and the complete integration and institutionalization of the program.

They note that although these stages do overlap, successful completion of each is dependent on the success of the previous one; and that all except the final stage involve conflict.

OTHER RELEVANT LITERATURE

Kahn's theory of social planning provides another conceptual framework within which one can analyze the process by which projects develop.[1] His concept of planning begins with the identification of planning instigators, the exploration of "the relevant aspects of social reality and the preferences of the relevant community,"[2] and a definition of the planning task. This is analogous to the diagnostic stage described by Lawrence and Lorsch, or the evaluation stage of Hage and Aiken. In essence, it includes some recognition of problem or need, an assessment of relevant values and environmental factors, and a delineation of objectives. Policy formulation is defined by him as "the general guide to action, the cluster of over-all decisions relevant to the achievement of the goal, the guiding principles..."[3] The action planning or initiation phases described earlier include policy formulation as an essential component, although they overlap with Kahn's programming phase. However, since in Kahn's paradigm, the stages of planning are interconnected, interdependent and overlapping, this is inevitable. Again, evaluation described as an on-going part of the planning process, also implies a potential for each phase being evaluated, albeit by different criteria. Thus, that stage of program development in which tasks are defined (and goals and objectives delineated) could be evaluated along different criteria than the stage in which policy is formulated and alternative approaches to programming considered.

---

[1] Alfred J. Kahn, Theory and Practice of Social Planning (New York: Russell Sage, 1969).

[2] Ibid., p. 61.

[3] Ibid., p. 131.

As discussed earlier, relevant discussions of the inadequacies of evaluation research indicate the need for studies of the processes of project growth and development and the need for comparative studies. Sarason points out that all existing studies of organizational growth and development deal with mature organizations.[1] He points out that in a major work on organizational theory and organizational development,[2] no article deals with new, emerging organizations. There are no studies of the problems of immature - young or new organizations or projects. He stresses the need for empirical studies describing how such organizations are created and how they develop.

In his discussion of organizational development and growth, Starbuck criticizes existing research for substituting theorizing for data collection and presenting data without adequate analysis.[1] He states that:

---

[1] Seymour B. Sarason, The Creation of Settings and the Future Societies (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1972).

[2] James G. March, Handbook of Organizations (Chicago: Rand McNally, 1965).

> At this point what is needed more than anything else is data - data on goals, data on behavior strategies, data on structural variables, data on nearly every aspect of organizational growth and development.[2]

The collection of such data is essential in order to provide a basis for working towards any development of theory and can only evolve from case studies of individual organizations as well as comparative studies of multiple organizations.[3].

Udy as well as Starbuck urges such comparative studies, suggesting that only through comparative analysis can any attempt be made to establish general principles about organizations.[4] He suggests that many different approaches can be employed since some researchers compare two organizations while others compare 200; some employ statistical techniques while others do not. He identifies the central issue in such a study as "What is the researcher trying to do? How is he trying to do it?"

Where the "what" is discovering the interrelationship between variables or constant characteristics of all organizations (e.g., the pattern of development), the "how" is more likely to be an exploration of data in order to make some sense out of it rather than testing hypotheses.[1] He concludes

---

[1] Willaim H. Starbuck, "Organizational Growth and Development," in March, op. cit., pp. 451-533.

[2] Ibid., p. 519.

[3] See also, Barney G. Glaser and Anselm L. Strauss, The Discovery of Grounded Theory: Strategies for Qualitative Research (Chicago: Aldine Publishing Co., 1967).

[4] Samuel H. Udy, Jr., "The Comparative Analysis of Organizations", March, op. cit., pp. 678-707

> In summary one finds a rather wide variety of procedures in common use in comparative organizational analysis. This variety stems partly from lack of knowledge of the nature of exploratory research; current needs of the field suggest an emphasis on the development of such knowledge, since exploration appears to be much more pertinent to comparative organizational studies at present than does hypothesis testing.[2]

Other studies have relevance for certain policy issues addressed by the proposed study or confirm the need for comparative studies and case studies of community programs. Kahn's distinction between case and policy advocacy,[3] and Briar's between client and group advocacy[4] are helpful in clarifying the base from which intervention into or with institutional networks on behalf of children proceeds. O'Donnell's study of neighborhood service centers offers perspective on the nature of community-based multi-service centers generally, and highlights an issue relevant to child advocacy also;whether such projects can encompass both a social action component as well as a direct service one.[1] Litwak's studies of organizational factors and social control in the community relate to the issue of how, under what conditions and around what issues community primary groups (of which community-based child advocacy projects are an illustration) can intervene in bureaucratic organizations.[2]

---

[1] Ibid., p. 680.

[2] Ibid., pp. 686-687.

[3] Kahn, Theory and Practice of Social Planning.

[4] Briar, op. cit.

Kramer's study of five community action programs illustrates the use of a comparative case study approach (the approach that will be utilized in this study) for describing, analyzing and evaluating community programs.[3] In addition, the purview of this study is not the total scope of community action policy and program but rather what he defines as the "most distinctive aspect" of the community action program.[4] Similarly, this study will focus on the most distinctive aspects of child advocacy projects, their advocacy activities.

---

[1] Edward J. O'Donnell and Otto M. Reid, "The Multi-Service Neighborhood Center: Preliminary Findings From a National Survey", *Welfare in Review*, IX, 3 (May/June, 1971) 1-8; O'Donnell and Marilyn M. Sullivan, "Service Delivery and Social Action Through the Neighborhood Center: A Review of Research", *Welfare in Review*, VII, 9 (November/December 1969) 1-12; See also, Grosser, *Helping Youth: A Study of Six Community Organization Programs*, (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Dept. of Health, Education and Welfare, 1968); Ralph Kramer, *Participation of the Poor: Comparative Community Case Studies in the War on Poverty*, (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1969).

[2] See, for example, Eugene Litwak, "An Approach to Linking in 'Grass Roots' Community Organizations" in Fred M. Cox, et al, eds. *Strategies of Community Organization* (Itaska, Ill.: F.E. Peacock, Publishing Co., 1970).

[3] Kramer, *op.cit.*; Grosser, *Helping Youth*.

[4] Kramer, *op. cit.*, p. 21.

Finally, discussions of field investigations and case studies, abound in the literature. Such an approach has been defined as

> the observation of people in situation, if by 'observation' is meant any and all of the techniques by means of which social investigators gather their data... such diverse methods as interviewing, observation and the analysis of documentary materials or other groups products may be utilized.[1]

Field studies may include studies of individual cases or multiple cases, or a community. They may be longitudinal or comparative or a combination of both. They may involve either sustained participation by the investigator, a short-term, more transitory participation, or a combination of both. Although the sustained approach is recommended for descriptive or exploratory studies, this recommandation is based in part on the time needed to establish a working relationship with the group or groups being studied.[2] Where this study is concerned, such a relationship has already been established. In addition, most of these projects have already been visited either by this investigator or an associate, at least once within the past year, in the course of the earlier study. Thus the suggestion for sustained participation in the course of this study seems less essential. Summarizing the need and importance of field studies, Freeman and Sherwood conclude

---

[1] W. Richard Scott, "Field Methods in the Study of Organizations", in March, op. cit., p. 262; see also, George A. McCall and J. L. Simmons, Issues in Participatant Observation, (Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co., 1969).

[2] Scott, op. cit., pp. 267-68.

> We do not have enough information about how the various health, education and welfare organizations, as well as persons in them actually operate. What policy makers think professionals and specialists do is often very different from what they actually do... Extensive and continual field investigations are required. This is an area of social policy research that clearly is undeveloped.[1]

Finally, reference to current evaluation studies of existing child advocacy projects and any internal evaluations of programs, will be referred to as relevant, in later chapters.

---

[1] Freeman and Sherwood, op. cit.

CHAPTER III

STUDY METHOD: THE FIRST PHASE

GENERAL SCOPE, APPROACH AND PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

The last chapter delineated the need for a differential strategy for evaluating social programs. In each case the approach taken should be related to the particular type of program - broad aim - research and demonstration - as well as to the phase of program development at the time of evaluation. Some alternative approaches to classifying these stages were identified and will be discussed in greater detail in Chapter V. Also noted was the need for comparative study of a number of such programs in order to describe how projects develop, to determine whether or not there are recognizable patterns of growth and to develop indices for classification of projects by developmental stage at the point of evaluation. Through such comparative analysis, criteria for evaluating each phase might be developed empirically.

Considering the problems related to evaluation generally, and the paucity of knowledge regarding how new projects begin and develop - in short, given the lack of certainty as to what is the norm and what is idiosyncratic - this study had to be essentially exploratory and descriptive.

It sought to develop a relevant approach to evaluation even if it had to be new and different. The difficulties, inappropriateness and unfeasibility of an experimental design were discussed in the previous chapter; the case for a process oriented, qualitative approach to evaluation was outlined there also. The latter approach was suggested as the desirable alternative, and is the approach utilized in the present study. Included were a combination of site visits, interviews, direct observation, intensive field studies and review of relevant program materials. All these efforts were addressed to two major purposes:

1) to identify, describe and analyze the phases through which community-based child advocacy projects proceed from inception to implementation;

2) to determine what the criteria for successful development might be at each phase and how such criteria might be formulated.

Pre-structuring the design for evaluation assumes both data and knowledge of criteria; as indicated in Chapter I, neither of these was available for child advocacy projects. Elsewhere, it has been suggested that in order to discover what concepts and hypotheses are relevant for the area one wishes to study, one must do an analysis of comparative data obtained from systematic empirical research and develop the theory inductively rather than deductively.[1]

---

[1] See Glaser and Straus, op. cit., for an over-all description and analysis of this approach; Sarason, op. cit. Stanley Cohen and Laurie Taylor, Psychological Survival: The Experience of Long Term Imprisonment (New York: Pantheon Books, 1972), represents an illustration of a partial application of the approach.

Following this approach, this study proceeded to develop its methodology empirically rather than theoretically, one step at a time. In this manner, the method evolved as the data were collected and analyzed.

SAMPLE COMPOSITION, SIZE AND SELECTION

The universe of child advocacy projects from which a sample of community-based projects was selected, was defined as follows: all programs identified as child advocacy projects through the national survey completed by the Child Advocacy Research Project in 1971-72.[1] Other criteria for selection were:

1) that the project selected be explicitly labeled "child advocacy"; either that child advocacy be part of the name of the project; that it have been defined as such by the funding source; or that it be self-defined.

2) that it be a project for which there are baseline data available from the 1971-72 study so as to assure a longitudinal view (questionnaires, interviews, and/or case studies).

3) that the project be community-based. Community-based is defined to mean that the primary target area identified by the project be either "neighborhood," "specific catchment area," or "community" (the latter defined to mean a small city or circumscribed geographic area with a population of less

---

[1] Additional and interesting child advocacy projects were identified subsequent to this survey. However, absence of baseline data for these projects precluded their inclusion. Similarly, some projects which were included in the initial study, proved not to be valid child advocacy projects after study and observation. This latter point will be discussed again in Chapter VI.

than 200,000).[1]

4) that the project appear to meet the definition of child advocacy adopted after the initial study and endorsed by OCD.("intervention on behalf of children in relation to those services and institutions impinging on their lives").

5) that the project be operating currently and have been funded at least six months prior to the beginning of this study but no more than two and one half years earlier (between March, 1970 and March, 1972). The decision to limit the age of the projects was taken to ensure that they had some "life experience" to study (at least six months old); but were not so far along chronologically as to make any retrospective recall of their initial experience impossible. (It was not known then that this criterion eliminated most projects that were fully operational!)

From the universe of 103 operating child advocacy projects for which baseline data were available[2], thirty-seven projects were identified as community-based[3]. This was the largest single category of projects, representing about one-third of the total universe.[4] Two projects were eliminated because, in their response to our mail survey, they described their program as direct service only, with no advocacy component and no effort at intervention or change in other institutions for either individuals or groups of children. Two more projects were eliminated because they were not operating at the time this study began. Four projects were eliminated because they were begun prior to March, 1970. Two more were eliminated when the funding agency and the project directors announced - prior to the onset of this study - that the projects were inappropriately labeled child advocacy and were not designed to provide advocacy in any fashion.

---

[1] For definition of "community," see Roland L. Warren, "The Interorganizational Field as a Focus for Intervention," in Fred M. Cox, et. al., eds., Strategies of Community Organization (Itasca, Ill.: F. E. Peacock Publishing Co., 1970); Irving A. Spergel "Community-based Delinquency Prevention Programs: An Overview," Social Service Review, Vol. 47, No. 1, March 1973, pp. 16-31, especially pp. 17-18.

[2] Kahn, Kamerman, McGowan, op. cit.

[3] Ibid., p. 53.

[4] There was some eventual overlap between community-based and city-based, in particular where small cities described themselves as "a community" or a single catchment area. The actual breakdown was 30% neighborhood; 20% state-based; 19% county-based; 19% city-based; 12% national.

Thus, the universe of community-based child advocacy projects meeting the specified criteria was reduced to twenty-seven projects. Of these, two were eliminated because of the limitations of the study's travel budget (one project was in Alaska; the other in Hawaii). One was excluded because of the difficulty in fitting it into scheduled field visits; and one other because two attempts at reaching the project were aborted because of weather conditions. However, with regard to these last two projects, both were Parent-Child Center-Advocacy Projects. Since the remaining sample of twenty-three projects included three others designed to follow the same model, failure to include these two would not appear to have biased the study. The final sample of twenty-three community-based child advocacy projects studied with reference to the "phasing-in" process, does not appear to be subject to any recognizable bias.

The projects studied are located in fourteen different states and twenty cities. When approached all agreed to participate in the study and all except one were visited by the researcher personally. (For further details and a general descriptive overview of the projects see Chapter IV.) For sixteen projects, supplementary data were available from among the case studies in the original study. Of these studies, four were completed by the present researcher and twelve by another staff member.

DATA COLLECTION

The study began with the development of a semi-structured interview guide (see Appendix) focused on questions related to the phasing-in process of these projects and influenced by the experience of the 1971-72 study. Although initially it was anticipated that all interviews would be tape recorded as they occurred, the discomfort of the first three interviewees and their request that interviews not be taped led to the elimination of this approach. Instead, extensive notes were made during the interviews. These notes, combined with personal observations and documentation by written progress reports, minutes of board and staff meetings and other related materials, provided substantial support for recalling interview content. Detailed reports of all interviews were dictated within a maximum of twenty-four hours after the visit and were subsequently analyzed and summarized both chronologically (in order to depict the actual life history of the project) as well as topically.

Site visits were made to twenty-two projects between October 16th and December 14th, 1972 and an extensive telephone interview was held with the staff of the remaining project in January of 1973. Most of these visits involved an entire day; no interview took less than three hours. The interviews were held with project directors and on occasion several staff members. In several of the projects, three or more staff members were interviewed in addition to the project directors. Wherever possible, in projects where formal proposals had been developed, interviews also were held with the people who developed the proposal.

As the appendix copy of the guide indicates, these interviews inquired about subjects such as the following:

- What was the background of the program? How long was the proposal in formulation? Who developed the proposal?
- When was the project funded? What was the source of funding? How were the funds channeled into the project? What was the size of the budget? How and by whom was fiscal control exercised?
- What were the organizational structure, auspices and staffing patterns of the program?
- When were staff recruited and hired? By what means? How long did it take? What was the nature of their training?
- When was the board selected? By what means? How long did it take?
- What action targets were first identified? When? By whom?

- What was the nature of the current program and its operational status? What were examples of current activities and when were these initiated? How did these compare with what was projected in the proposal and at various intermediate points?

After the first five projects were visited, data obtained were analyzed and the interview guide refined further. The major changes made were: to avoid the obvious use of the guide during the interview; to decrease the number of questions posed directly; and to encourage all interviewees to "tell the story of the project from its beginning to the present." This approach was employed with each staff member in a separate interview. Different perspectives were followed up later. Sometimes differences were resolved by written reports and documentation; sometimes in further discussion; sometimes they were unresolved.[1] The interviewer posed direct questions only to clarify, to probe or to obtain needed information that did not flow naturally.

As indicated earlier, case studies had been made of sixteen of the twenty-three projects in the sample as part of the 1971-72 study. In these, data obtained covering the previous year's experience were compared with the original case studies and, except for one project, were substantially consistent with the earlier material.[1] This approach provided some confirmation of the reliability of the data obtained regarding the phasing-in of new projects.

---

[1] When there were unresolved differences regarding definition of goals, objectives, tasks, roles, between project directors and staff, for example, it was considered an indication of intra-organizational "dissonance" or conflict.

In the initial design projection, it was anticipated that once the first phase of the study was completed, data would be analyzed to determine whether there were identifiable patterns of project development, identifiable stages of development, and whether criteria for successful work at each stage might be specified. If so, an instrument would be developed to classify projects at each stage and to evaluate them accordingly.

It was also anticipated that subsequently, a sub-sample of six projects would be selected for more intensive study so as to provide a test of the applicability and reliability of the instrument developed, to further specify criteria for evaluation of child advocacy projects, and to refine the instrument generally. Criteria for selection of this sub-sample would be derived from the data provided by the first phase of the study. Although it was assumed that the project analysis in this second phase would be more intensive than in the earlier phase, exactly what was meant by this or what it would entail was not clear. As will be noted in subsequent chapters, analysis of the data collected in the first phase of the study did guide the later phase, but not precisely into the expected channels.

---

[1] The inconsistency in this instance related to the project director's definition of the source of intra-organizational conflict. In the initial interview for the '71-'72 study, she had assumed responsibility and blame; in the interview for the current study, the burden of blame was placed elsewhere. Since the existence of conflict was not an issue (it was identified as a major problem for the project in all instances) the question of "blame" for its existence did not make for any substantial difference in the findings.

The next chapter begins with a description of the phasing-in of a sample of community-based child advocacy projects (their life history from inception and development to current activities at the time studied). Analysis and classification of the data obtained provide the basis for the following:

1) Determination of patterns of "normal development";
2) Identification of stages in the developmental process;
3) Identification of tasks for each of these phases or stages.

With the data so obtained, it becomes possible, then, to turn to the remaining portion of the study.

4) Development of indices of project development in order to determine what expectations are reasonable after specified periods of time subsequent to funding;
5) Identification of evaluation criteria for each developmental stage, such criteria to be derived empirically from the descriptive data obtained;
6) Development of an instrument for differential evaluation;
7) A field test of this instrument to be applied to a sub-sample of six projects selected from the twenty-three, and an analysis of the findings.

The following chapters illustrate how this approach evolved and how the instrument was developed.

CHAPTER IV

THE NATURAL HISTORY OF COMMUNITY-BASED CHILD ADVOCACY PROJECTS

This study's premise is that program evaluation must be phase-specific. One asks different questions and employs different criteria at different stages in the development of a community-based child advocacy project. The first major task, therefore, is to evolve a way to describe a project's natural history. The twenty-three case studies were assembled with this aim in view. They provided the raw material for an effort at discerning project stages and process. This chapter offers a first attempt at ordering the data in a fashion which may serve the needs of those interested in community-based child advocacy projects as organizations - and those concerned with their assessment. Among the questions addressed are:

- Why are child advocacy projects launched? Where do the ideas originate?
- How are child advocacy projects designed?
- What specific activities are involved in actually setting up such projects in their earliest stages?
- How do child advocacy projects progress from initiating ideas and proposals to operating organizations?

- How do these projects change and differ over time?

WHAT DO THE PROJECTS LOOK LIKE?

An Overview

Before proceeding with the life stories of these projects, a brief descriptive overview will provide a picture of how they looked at the time of the study. Twenty-three projects are in the sample studied. Of these, twenty describe themselves as either child or youth advocacy projects; three had the label applied to them, albeit inappropriately, by funding agencies. All describe themselves as "community-based," with the qualifications about "community" mentioned in the last chapter. At the time of the study, the typical project is about one and a half years old and is located in a ghetto or lower working class community. It is administratively autonomous, although usually under the auspices of another public agency or institution, which generally acts merely as a conduit for funds. (The auspice may also be referred to as "the sponsoring agency.") It is federally funded with a relatively small budget. Staff are paid, few in number, and tend to be indigenous paraprofessionals. It addresses the needs of children and their families, rather than children alone. It attempts to solve problems related to the unresponsiveness of service systems working with children (especially schools and/or the juvenile justice system) or the failure to implement rights and entitlements. Generally, it employs lay advocacy rather than legal and stresses case advocacy, while trying - or hoping - to implement class advocacy.

Additional detail is needed for orientation and to provide context for the description of activities in the several stages of organizational development.

Where are the Projects Located?

The twenty-three projects included in this study are situated in fourteen different states. Five are in one state, California. Two projects are in each of the following: Maryland, New Jersey, North Carolina, Ohio and Tennessee. The remainder are located in Arkansas, Colorado, Indiana, Massachusetts, New York, Pennsylvania, Texas and Washington. They are primarily urban; seventeen are located in major urban centers, two in small cities and four are rural. Sixteen are specifically "neighborhood" focused, by which is meant a single housing project, an area of a few blocks, or a single institution. Of those serving a larger geographic area, all are located in cities having populations of less than 200,000.

Who are the Consumers or Clients?

In general, the projects are concerned with children (or youth) as well as their families. Ten stress advocacy for all children in their community; three for all under the age of five; three, specifically for poor, minority youth (although in reality this is true for all projects located in ghetto communities even when they state "all children," by the very nature of their community); four, for delinquent and predelinquent youth; and two, for children situated within a single institutional system (hospital, institution for the retarded).

The size of the target population (the consumers, clients or potential beneficiaries of the program) ranges from 25 to 23,000. The actual number varies, depending upon whether it is based on the total number of children in the community or only a limited segment; whether it is related to potential consumers of direct service and case advocacy or potential beneficiaries of class advocacy. For example, six projects with specific limitations on their target population (e.g., a single institution, children 0-5, two classes in a school) service between 100-500 children; eight projects which serve an unspecified population including a wider age range, have 1000-2000 in their target population; those projects providing class advocacy serve the largest number of children, generally several thousand. Although the age range of children served is 0-18, fifteen projects concentrate on school age children.

Who Sponsors and Who Funds These Projects?

Sponsorship by public agencies - community mental health centers, universities, boards of education, hospitals, community action programs - is characteristic of almost two-thirds of these projects. Eight are under voluntary auspices - local branches of national organizations, voluntary hospitals, private universities; one is funded directly. More than half (12) are administered as autonomous organizations. Three are administered under the close supervision of the sponsoring organization, while five are merely new components of ongoing and existing projects.

Public funding, in particular, federal funding, predominates; and even those projects supported by voluntary funds are currently seeking extensive public funding. Seventeen projects are funded by the federal government, two by state governments, and two by voluntary funds. Two have still not obtained formal funding.

Annual budgets range from a low of $27,000 to a high of $250,000 but most range between $100,000 and $200,000 a year. On first observation, neither this, nor the earlier study suggests any direct correlation between the size of the budget and any other variable. The two projects with the lowest and highest budgets respectively are both described by their directors as never having been implemented. Those projects with budgets of under $100,000 tend to have very small paid staff (1-3), or rely heavily on volunteers.

For the most part, fiscal control is exercised by the auspice or sponsoring agency. Although some directors are not permitted to authorize any expenditure without approval from their auspice, most have a wide range of discretionary authority in fiscal matters. Several developed their own budgets and are considered accountable for remaining within them. Four project directors have authority to sign checks. In one, the director assigned fiscal control to an elected community board; however, after less than one year, he changed this policy and control reverted to him.

Who Determines Policy?

For the most part, the projects follow traditional, hierarchical patterns in their structures. They are organized in a two or three tier hierarchy, with an administrative director at the top and an assistant director under him, responsible for the supervision of line staff. Where there are specialist staff, such as researchers, lawyers, social workers, psychologists, they report directly to the director. Most of the authority for decision making is vested in the director of the project with some degree of involvement of staff, and to a lesser extent board. Only three of the projects have policy-making boards and these are all appointed, not elected. Most have ad-hoc advisory boards, usually composed of professionals and influentials; these are relatively inactive and meet irregularly on an as-needed basis. Boards appear to be a major problem for all of these projects and as such will be discussed in greater detail later.

Who Are The Child Advocates?

Although administrators and supervisors tend to be professionals, advocate staff are overwhelmingly paraprofessional. Two-thirds of the projects are staffed almost completely by paraprofessionals who for the most part are indigenous, young, with limited formal education but usually high school graduates, and relatively inexperienced. Even when older, they usually have had very little formal work experience. Only two projects are predominantly professional while three are about evenly divided between professional and paraprofessional. Five of the projects have largely white staff; ten are primarily black, one chicano, and the remainder racially and ethnically mixed. The size of paid staff ranges from a minimum of one to a maximum of twenty-one. All projects except one have paid staff. Six have fewer than four employees; eleven projects have between five and ten (including secretarial help); four have between fifteen and twenty employees and one project has twenty-one. This last project is described by its director as "deliberately staff heavy," because it is preparing for the establishment of two satellite projects. Four projects utilize only volunteers as advocates although three of these have paid administrative staff; two others use volunteers in ancillary roles but for the most part, staff is paid.

Initially, four of the projects anticipated employing both part-time and full-time staff. By the end of the first year, part-time staffing was eliminated by all of these projects. Because of the need for substantial investment in supervision and training, such staff were defined as an expensive and inefficient use of supervisory manpower. (Where professionals such as lawyers and social workers were employed on a part-time basis, this did not hold true.) For many part-time employees, salaries are so low that obtaining full-time employment, if possible, is essential.

Staff turnover has ranged from almost a complete change in staff, in one project , to no turnover at all in another. In four projects, more than half of the staff changed during the first year. In twelve, turnover was limited to less than two people. In two projects, where staff were sharply reduced at the end of one year, it came as a result of the elimination of part-time staff. Seven directors also changed within the first year of operation. Four of these were the same as those in which staff turnover was high generally; in another, the assistant director who had been involved in the initial planning of the project, subsequently was named director, ensuring some continuity of leadership; in one other, a one year tenure for the director had been anticipated from the inception of the project.

As of the Time of the Study, What Do the Projects Do and How Do They Do It?

Twenty projects state that "systems change" or "institutional change" is a major objective. Those located in heavily serviced urban communities, stress as objectives a linking of people with appropriate services, ensuring a greater responsiveness of services to people's needs (e.g., obtaining evening and Saturday clinic hours, evening Parent Teacher Association meetings) and ensuring that people obtain their legal rights and those services they are entitled to. Projects located in underserviced communities and rural areas generally emphasize the need to generate new services to fill existing gaps. In some of the more deprived communities child advocacy becomes an umbrella concept and is used to highlight gross inadequacies harmful to children such as poverty, youth and adult unemployment, poor housing, absence of public transportation. These needs are so pervasive that they preclude a focus on more specialized needs of children.

Of the group of twenty self-defined advocacy projects, all provide access services (information, referral, follow-up, brokerage); sixteen provide case advocacy specifically; four have implemented class advocacy. Although most of the others continued to anticipate such action, only one project thus far sees a conflict between case and class advocacy; however, in two, the functions are kept separate.

Thirteen projects provide some form of direct services (counseling, tutoring, recreation), some out of deliberate choice - to obtain credibility in the community - some because inadequacies in existing services impel advocate practitioners toward such provision; some because of confusion about the boundaries of advocate practitioner roles - administrators, supervisors, staff and sometimes clients are often unclear as to parameters.

The overwhelming majority of the projects emphasize external advocacy and are concerned with implementing change in a system or systems other than their own (18). Two stress the need for internal advocacy and monitoring of the system in which they are based; one of these has never been able to implement this. Three have no pretensions to advocacy at all.

Lay advocacy is characteristic of almost all the projects. Only three have a legal component, involving lawyers as part of the staff. A small number of the others use legal consultants or refer clients to legal service programs for individual needs.

The entry point for advocacy tends to be the individual case. In those projects where the entry point is a survey or a study of community needs or problems, advocacy is still initially implemented on an individual case basis during the course of staff interviewing families. In a few projects a local service system such as the school system, is the entry point for advocacy. Thus, case advocacy predominates and class advocacy, where it exists, seems to evolve from identification of a group of individual cases with similar problems, or in a few instances, from monitoring a service system.

The projects are about evenly divided between those in which advocacy is a specialized role and those in which advocacy is a general practitioner's role. However, only in the PCC - Advocacy Programs and one internal advocacy project is a distinction made between "advocacy staff" and "other staff." In general, where projects provide services other than advocacy, the practitioners are generalists. Where the project is clearly concentrating on advocacy activities almost to the exclusion of anything else (and there are very few of these) the practitioners are specialists.

How Old Are These Projects?

The relatively brief lives of these projects provide a unique opportunity for reviewing the process of creation and development. At the time they were studied, four were between two and two and a half years old (subsequent to funding); sixteen, about one and one half; and three between eight months and one year. All began at a time when there was still no conceptual clarity regarding child advocacy and when role and function were still unclear.

THE LIFE HISTORIES OF COMMUNITY CHILD ADVOCACY PROJECTS

An Overview

In studying the life history of child advocacy projects, the first discovery and perhaps the most important, was the complexity of the process and the enormous number of discrete activities involved. After studying only a few, it was already apparent that there were many things done between the time ideas for the projects first germinated and when they finally became operational. By the time the process was completed for all twenty-three, certain activities could be identified as characteristic of all or most of the projects, while others were idiosyncratic or present only in a few. Regardless of the number of activities completed, the order in which they occurred and the time when they took place varied substantially during the early years of the projects' lives.

The following list of activities derived from analysis of the case studies, is presented to indicate the range and extensiveness of what was done during this period. It also offers the "raw material" for a first approximation in the conceptualization of stages in the natural history of a community-based project. The presence of an item does not imply that all projects experienced the activity or even that most projects did. Nor did these activities necessarily occur in the same order in all projects in which they were found.

- Someone (or some organization) has an idea about establishing a child advocacy project and decides to do something about it.

- Someone (or some organization) is stimulated by the availability of money for setting up new projects, begins to think about what child advocacy is and whether it can be a useful approach in designing a new project.
- A problem or a need related to children is identified in the community.
- One or more objectives are identified.
- The meaning and implications of child advocacy are explored.
- A conceptual framework for solving the problem is developed.
- A target community is identified.
- A target population is identified.
- One or more targets for change are identified.
- Strategies for achieving objectives are identified or designed.
- An organizational structure is designed.
- A leader, leadership group or developer is identified.
- An auspice is obtained.

- Potential consumers are involved.

- Relevant experts are involved.

- Other organizations are involved.

- An expert is hired to prepare a proposal.

- A new program component is designed that is consonant with the existing project.

- A leader prepares a proposal.

- Formal contacts are made with funding sources.

- A formal proposal is submitted to a funding agency.

- A memorandum is prepared and submitted to higher administration.

- Funding is sought.

- Funding is obtained.

- A decision is made to establish a project without formal funding.

- Administrative support is obtained for a new program component.

- An office is obtained.

- Equipment is purchased.

- Administrative staff is recruited and hired.
- Supervisory staff is recruited and hired.
- Line staff is recruited and hired.
- Specialist staff is recruited and hired.
- Consultants are recruited and hired.
- Volunteers are recruited and hired.
- Staff is trained.
- An advisory board is appointed and convened.
- A policy-making board is appointed and convened.
- Board members are elected and the board is convened.
- A community is organized.
- Consumers participate in developing the program.
- Experts participate in developing the program.
- Other organizations participate in developing the program.
- First action targets are specified.
- First action strategies are specified.
- Clientele is contacted.

- Referral sources are contacted.
- Target(s) are contacted.
- Direct services are first provided.
- Access services are first provided.
- A survey or other form of information gathering is begun.
- Case advocacy is first provided.
- Class advocacy is first provided.
- Reports are written and submitted.
- The board is reorganized.
- The administrative structure is reorganized.
- The staffing pattern is reorganized.
- Goals are specified.
- Goals are changed.
- Targets are changed.
- Strategies are changed.
- The program is reorganized.
- Coalitions are formed with other groups or organizations.

- Case advocacy becomes a major program component.

- Class advocacy becomes a major program component.

- The project is duplicated elsewhere.

Any detailed description of these activities, including some mention of how and when they occur, is made cumbersome by the very extensiveness of the list. Yet, any attempt at conceptualizing the process requires that they be described first before being ordered and analyzed. Since in viewing the historical development of these projects, it becomes readily apparent that many activities tend to cluster within certain periods of time, some primitive categories suggest themselves and serve to focus attention on critical factors. Thus, for this purpose, this description of the life cycle of child advocacy projects may be divided into three parts: beginnings (Why do child advocacy projects begin? Where do the ideas originate? How are they designed?); getting established (What is involved in actually setting up a child advocacy project?); operations (How do these projects progress from initiating ideas and proposals to operating organizations?)

The first time period, "beginnings" culminates when projects obtain funding or when, for some other reason, a decision is made to establish a project. The second, "getting established" ends when the project begins to provide case or class advocacy. Finally, projects are assumed to be "fully operational" when case or class advocacy is not only provided regularly but represents a major portion of the project activities.

BEGINNINGS

Where Do The Ideas Originate?

Sarason points out in his book, The Creation of New Settings, that "In the past decade or so, more new settings (e.g., organizations, institutions, programs, projects)... have been created than in the entire previous history of the human race."[1] He comments that one characteristic common to almost all initiators or developers of new settings is the absence of any historical perspective, either with regard to the origin of the project or the relationship between what they are currently planning and other earlier but relevant experiences. These child advocacy projects are no exception. For most, the process of creating a new project is analogous to reinventing the wheel; almost without exception, the directors view the process as unique and idiosyncratic. In only six cases had directors heard of the term "child advocacy" before beginning to plan their projects and in only four of these was there any familiarity with the Joint Commission report and its recommendations and/or the recommendations of the 1970 White House Conference on Children and Youth. An additional six were familiar with the concept of "client advocacy," however, only four of these had considered applying the concept to the problems of children and youth. In general, concern about quantitative and qualitative inadequacies in services for children and youth, fragmentation of services, the unresponsiveness of existing services and institutions, and the failure to implement existing rights and entitlements, led initiators to search out and experiment with new forms of programming and to be attracted by the emerging concept of child advocacy once they learned of it. Considering the similar concerns expressed in the early sixties regarding the organization and delivery of social services generally, it is indeed surprising that only about one half of the project directors were familiar with the relevant experiences of community action programs. For the most part, developers of these projects described the problems in their communities as "recently identified" and saw the projects they developed as being newborn like "Venus on the Half-Shell."

---

[1] Sarason, op. cit., p. 2.

How Did These Projects Begin?

In reviewing the data related to how child advocacy projects begin, the first interesting finding is that spontaneous initiatives from community residents or organized community groups appear to have played no role in stimulating or developing an advocacy project. Since the literature makes frequent mention of the importance of community pressures in generating new organizations, its absence as an initiating factor for these projects is noteworthy. Whether this is an indication of community disinterest, unfamiliarity with a new concept, or the weakness of community pressure as an initiating force, cannot be discerned from the existing data. However, what can be noted is that once projects are conceived by others, documentation of community needs is readily accomplished, and many projects obtain widespread community support.

In contrast to the absence of community pressures as an initiating force, four other factors emerge as stimulating the development of child advocacy projects: One group of projects began as a result of the initiatives of an individual or small group; a second group began in response to funding agencies' direct or indirect initiatives; a third group began as a result of sponsoring organizations' search for new funds to support existing programs, and finally, the fourth group began because one federal agency announced that a grant would be provided to certain specified projects for the establishment of new advocacy components, as an extension of their existing programs.

Although each project began in one of these four ways, in only one pattern of initiation was the availability of new funds not the single most important factor. Regardless of the specific role played by funding agencies, the availability of new funds for the creation of child advocacy projects appears to have been a primary stimulus either by influencing the development of a proposal or by directly initiating the process. However, as seen below, the specific way in which a project begins does appear to have some relation to the types of activities performed and the length of time covered by this beginning phase.

Number of Projects	How Projects Began	Months covered from beginning activity to proposal submission (or establishment of project)			
		2-4.9	5-7.9	8-10.9	11+
8	Individual Initiative	1	2	1	4
7	Funding Agency Initiative	3	3		1**
4*	Sponsoring Agency Initiative		3		
4	Funding Agency Authorization	3			1

*Length of time covered for one project is not known.

**This project began as a result of both individual initiatives and funding agency initiatives.

Individual Initiatives: In eight projects an individual or group of individuals had an idea; discussed it; designed a program; possibly prepared an informal proposal;

and then actively sought funding for it. In one project, child advocacy was viewed as a means for protecting children's rights in closed institutions. In two, initially there was just some general concern about the low priority for children's services and the concept that child advocacy might provide a new framework in which to pressure a community or institution to re-order its priorities. In five, there was concern about a particular problem (delinquency, inadequate protection of children's and/or students' rights, unresponsiveness of the schools to students' needs, or the failure to view the child within his total environment and the consequent inappropriateness of interventive strategies).

For the most part, this group begun by individual initiatives, includes the oldest of the projects, the developers who were most familiar with the concept of child advocacy, and with the exception of two, those projects with the most extensive activities prior to obtaining funding. With regard to the two exceptions, neither are defined by their directors as having been implemented at the time of the study.

Although the period of time devoted to planning a project ranged from two months to two years, four of these were planned over a period of about one year. One that was developed within a very brief period of time is described by its director as never having been implemented; one other was explicitly modeled after another, more extensively planned project; a third that was begun in less than a year is unique in that it was developed by people who have extensive experience with related projects and with the relevant community; were intensely committed to the conceptual framework employed and to the objectives and strategies incorporated in the project; and already had an existing constituency in the community and a great deal of personal credibility.

Although these eight projects completed all the standard activities such as identifying a problem, objectives, target community and target population, designing a structure, selecting an auspice, most are unusual in comparison with the remaining fifteen, in that they were designed within a specific conceptual framework. In addition, most spent extensive time in contacting both experts and consumers who might be interested in such a project as well as relevant organizations and agencies in the community. These contacts were accomplished through a variety of formal and informal means, such as meetings, workshops, personal contacts. Finally, as a group, they are unique in that no outside professional was responsible for the preparation of any of the proposals subsequently submitted to funding agencies. Where formal proposals requesting funding by outside sources were developed by this group, all were prepared within a very brief period of time - one or two weeks.

Funding Agency Initiatives: A second group of seven projects began in response to funding agencies' active initiation of proposal development, either by publicizing the availability of funds for child advocacy projects or by personal contact, suggesting that proposals for such projects would be of interest to an agency. For two other projects this influence was an important factor in determining the particular "look" that the project finally developed.

One organization notified over 100 institutions, agencies and individuals that it was interested in funding community-based child advocacy projects; individual officials and administrators informally notified many others. In two other agencies, administrators telephoned practitioners as well as researchers informing them of agency interest in such a project and the availability of funding. In all of these, the projects were deliberately designed and tailored to meet implicit and explicit guidelines of funding agencies. A vague conceptual framework was provided by the agency to stimulate individuals to explore possibilities for programming. Like the first group of planners, they then proceeded to select people to help design a program: to identify objectives and strategies; to begin to develop constituencies; and to prepare a formal proposal.

In general, this group that began in response to funding agencies' initiatives, accomplished the widest and most disparate range of activities. For example, one project went so far to obtain community involvement and support while developing a proposal for submission to a federal agency, that the leadership group assured the community a child advocacy project would be established within one year, with or without federal funds. To reinforce this promise, before receiving any indication of favorable response on their proposed project, they actively engaged in community organizing, held elections for board membership and even convened a board. In another case, equally strong efforts of another type were employed to generate widespread community support. The leadership group met with the main community organization, discussed community needs and priorities and prepared a proposal which was then submitted first to this group for approval. When the group rejected it, several weeks were spent in further discussion culminating in the preparation of a completely new proposal which was finally endorsed by the group and then submitted for funding.

On the other hand, several projects made no effort at all to ensure community and/or consumer support. However, most did obtain outside experts to provide advice and in some cases technical assistance, especially with regard to preparing proposals.

For these seven, as for the projects described earlier, the period of time covering these activities ranged from two months to two years, however, most were planned in about five or six months.

Sponsoring Agency Initiatives: A third approach to beginning a child advocacy project was one in which the sponsoring agency or auspice developed a proposal in order to expand an existing program or some variation of it, and then sought funding. In some, the proposal was written and rewritten several times for submission to different funding sources and private foundations. The four projects funded as a consequence of this route, include those where the directors were totally unfamiliar with the term child advocacy and openly expressed ignorance as to the reason for the label having been appended. In some instances, the label was applied by the sponsors specifically to obtain funding. Although individual practitioners in the project might be involved in occasional advocacy activities, as a whole the project was not. For the most part these projects are characterized by an extensive gap between the conceptual framework of the proposal and the way the program looks in operation. All proposals in this group were written by professional proposal writers who had no real relationship to the project; none of the directors participated in the planning process; all "inherited" a proposal which they then had to implement. For some, conflict between the sponsoring agency and the project director became a major source of difficulty once the program began operating.

Although in this group it is harder to delineate exactly how and when the project was planned, the formal ingredients are all present on paper: Problem definition; identification of objectives, strategies, target community and target population. However, in none of these is there any indication of any real community involvement, either professional or lay, in the early activities.

Funding Agency Authorization: Finally, three projects began because the Office of Child Development wanted to promote advocacy activities in Parent Child Centers. These three, along with four other Parent Child Centers, were selected to be the recipients of a specific grant to enable them to plan and develop new advocacy program components. Guidelines were laid down and included a statement of general objectives. An evaluation research consultant was involved from the inception to help directors to find measurable objectives and to obtain baseline data. This group is unique in that funding preceded planning. Developers were completely unfamiliar with the concept of child advocacy until the funding agency made the grant. Perhaps because of funding agency requirements as well as the fact that these were new components of existing projects rather than completely new projects, none took longer than five months to plan and prepare a formal proposal and most took less time.

One of the first activities of these projects was overcoming the resistance of existing staff and board to becoming actively involved in planning a program that was not of their choosing and did not reflect their priorities. Possibly related to this sense of uninvolvement in the planning process and an absence of commitment to the project, as a group these projects indicated that they had had the most difficulty with formal proposal preparation.

Thus, activities here involved not only those related to developing a new program, but integrating it into an already existing one, when neither director, staff, nor board initiated it. Among these activities were: discovering what might be meant by child advocacy; designing a program component consonant with the existing project; deciding whether to recruit new staff or employ staff from the existing project; avoiding conflict between the new component and the existing project.

In contrast to these problems related to beginning a new component of an existing program and planning under pressure from the funding agency, other problems arise when the planning begins without any assurance of funding. Obviously, starting a project under such circumstances implies a willingness to risk or gamble - time and effort - and thus necessitates a substantial commitment by the initiators and developers to the project and its goals.

For analytic purposes it seems appropriate to conceptualize the end of this first phase with proposal preparation and submission. For the fact is that in almost all cases (18) these beginning activities culminated in the preparation of a formal proposal; two others prepared a written memorandum, while in three the process never concluded with the preparation of any kind of document although a decision was made to establish a project. Several of the proposals were prepared, submitted, rejected, reviewed and re-submitted. For some projects, the process may end here. Some projects in this study changed their design and mission as a result of this process. Regardless, for the group that proceeded to the next series of activities, this is the end of the beginning phase.

GETTING A CHILD ADVOCACY PROJECT ESTABLISHED

Once planning for a new project is completed (and this is generally considered to be once it is funded), the issue is how to move from the theoretical proposal to an operating program? How does one implement a plan? Even in the two projects where special funds have not been secured, a time arrived when the initiators decided to go ahead and "try the theory out" and actually develop an operating project.

There appear to be three approaches to this process of establishing a new program. They can be described as crash programming, developmental programming and structured programming.

Crash programming is the approach followed by almost half the projects studied (11). This process involves the implicit assumption that the proposal developed addressed all major problems and practice issues and could be readily and rapidly implemented. Except in one case, within three months after the projects were funded, directors, assistant directors, staff and secretarial help were hired; advisory boards or policy-making boards were appointed or elected; staff were trained; other agencies were contacted; and doors were opened for service.

In several of these staff were recruited from existing host projects or from a component program of the sponsoring organization, in particular one that had just lost its funding. In one project, where the board was responsible for recruitment and hiring, several board members resigned to take staff positions.

Staff training tended to be minimal for this group. Between one and two weeks were spent in orienting line staff to each other, to the project, and instructing them in their roles and functions. In those projects where staff were professional, trained or experienced, it was assumed that no training was necessary; where staff were inexperienced, this failure to provide more extensive training was often defined as a problem by the director of the project subsequently. In most, staff tended to describe their roles in conventional terms of direct service provision.

Specifically, this group includes the projects that were required to move rapidly by a funding agency providing a one year grant for what was expected to be a one year project. The agency insisted that the projects be operational within two to three months after approval of the proposal and placed further pressure on the project by involving outside evaluators who needed to obtain immediate baseline data. Related to this, the projects were required to have begun a survey of community needs and priorities and to have interviewed a certain number of families within a specified period of time. The directors involved have subsequently indicated in interviews that this pressure for instant service delivery led to a variety of later problems. For example, there was inadequate time to recruit competent staff and inadequate time to train staff; thus, interviews in the community were done inappropriately and information was often discovered later to be inaccurate; cases requiring advocacy activities were not serviced; where case advocacy occurred, no subsequent follow-up by practitioners completed the process.

A second cluster of projects employing this approach is one in which the sponsoring agency was responsible for planning the project. (One of these projects was "lost" for one year after funding and nothing was done by the sponsoring organization to establish it during that time!)[*] For these, administrative (and sometimes all) staff were hired almost immediately by the directors of the sponsoring agency. Proposals for these projects were uniformly prepared and written by professional proposal writers having nothing to do with the project; subsequently, they were given to newly hired directors, who were told to implement them. Often with barely enough time or background to integrate it or raise questions about it, the directors were supposed to "get the project going."

---

[*] A city received notification of an award but nothing was done about it for one year.

Although part of normal project development is coping with problems, most of this group of eleven appeared to be dominated by problems, and these may have derived from the "crash programming." Except for one project, all of these were in difficulty by the end of their first year of operation and most, if not all, readily acknowledged it. As a group, these projects had the highest rate of staff turnover (the highest is a project that does not really belong in the study at all; it is not an advocacy project but was inappropriately labeled as such by the funding agency.)

All those that had boards - elected or appointed, advisory or policy-making - have had problems with them, in some instances leading to dissolution and subsequent restructuring of the board. For example, one elected board that was described as "policy-making," included ten lay representatives from the community and six professionals who worked there. Not only did the professionals dominate the board but they were so identified with their own vested interests that they could never agree on any issue and were in constant conflict with administration and staff. By the end of the first year, the board was dissolved by the principal investigator of the project and only after four months had passed was another attempt made at electing a board. None of the original members were re-elected. A second project had included as one of its objectives the establishment of a policy-making youth board. While preparing for elections in the local high schools the project administrator decided that the youths were too radical and concluded that it would be an error to hold elections. Thus, the board has never been established during the eighteen months of its existence. In a third, the board was elected from the community with the understanding that it would make policy. When the director of the sponsoring organization imposed extensive restrictions on what it could do, conflict arose. By the end of the first year, none of the youth members and few of the adult members were attending meetings; in effect, the board was dead. Where advisory boards were appointed, for the most part, they were composed of influential lay people in the community or professionals and are described as "ad hoc boards." Generally, these boards met one or two times during the first year or two of the project's life and appeared to be relatively uninvolved in the regular activities of the project.

Several projects have undergone administrative reorganization after about one year or even less, and others have reorganized staffing patterns or programming activities.

In some cases, these actions were described as a consequence of existing difficulties in the project. For example, an appointed policy-making board could not agree on what the objectives of the program should be, let alone priorities for developing it and thus was dissolved after about six months and a new board was appointed. At the time of the study, this board was still in the process of considering what the objectives of the project should be. In other cases, changes were instituted in response to the decision to further specify goals and strategies and to improve program functioning. One project eliminated its lowest level staff, part-time assistants from the community, because they were too inexperienced to work independently, could not be effectively supervised by line staff who were equally inexperienced, and required too much time from supervisory staff.

At the close of the first year, most of these projects still did not describe themselves as "fully operational." Most specified obstacles and problems around implementing their program and, interestingly, none of these problems had been anticipated by the directors. What problems did arise were defined solely as a consequence of external factors: funding agency pressures; sponsoring agency interference; conflicting guidelines; lack of money. Inadequate planning, poor leadership or hastily implemented programs were rarely seen as the source of difficulty.

The second largest group of projects (7) employed a developmental approach to programming. As a whole, these projects were trying to develop by a process of "learning through doing." Some learned well, others not. For these, establishing an organizational structure was defined as the first activity. Once this was accomplished, most directors assumed that programming activities would evolve naturally.

Thus, the first activities for a new project, once funded, were to recruit and hire a director, an assistant director, and to obtain a physical facility (an office). Generally, this took about two to six months. Most projects had difficulty obtaining office space. Highly visible and readily accessible space, that was reasonably comfortable and available for rent, was difficult to obtain. Several projects began with temporary space, and one began in the director's home. Some directors defined this difficulty in obtaining office space as an obstacle to project implementation while others treated it as a minor impediment. Once administrative and supervisory staff were hired, advocate staff were recruited and hired from within the target community. Generally, this process covered a period of two to four months. During this time, directors were beginning to meet with administrators and representatives of other agencies and organizations in the community, to explain the nature of the new project and to develop informal, cooperative linkages with them.

Following this, staff were trained. Training tended to be done by administrative and supervisory staff. Except in two projects it was relatively informal, covering a wide range of time from a few days to six weeks. For some, it was seen as a one shot process while for others it was built into an ongoing staff development program.

One project instituted a formal six week training program for its indigenous paraprofessional staff. Social workers, teachers, police and probation officers were invited to meet with the staff and describe their roles and explain their agency's programs. Social workers provided instruction in interviewing skills; teachers explained the workings of the local school system; police and probation officers identified some of their concerns regarding community youth; representatives of other agencies in the community came to describe their own programs and indicate what relevant resources existed for the new project. This training program was repeated at the beginning of the project's second year and both old and new staff were expected to participate. Furthermore, by that time, the administrator of the project had established a relationship with a local branch of a well known college and staff were encouraged to take courses leading to formal credentials.

Staff training provided another route for publicizing some programs and mobilizing constituencies for them. Representatives of social agencies, civic groups, community organizations, were brought to projects to speak to staff and explain their agency's function as well as to get clarification about the activities of the new projects. Often, meetings were held in the community with parent groups, to provide open forums for informal discussion of community problems and issues and to elicit some indication of community priorities requiring advocacy-type intervention.

Specialized professional staff, such as lawyers, were much more difficult to recruit and in all projects employing such staff, the process lasted for between six to eight months. Except for this category, all of these projects had a full complement of staff by the end of the first six months.

In addition, two had established advisory boards composed of professionals and community influentials. The remaining four had deliberately decided not to establish a board until the project was firmly established.

Some form of service provision - access services, counseling, tutoring - or other activities such as planning or data collection, were begun between the fifth and eighth month after funding. In particular, projects that offer more traditional services began providing them earlier than others. When provided, advocacy activities began later. Contacting the community - clients, potential clients, agencies, and organizations who were potential sources of referral as well as other services - continued throughout this period. Toward the end of the first year, one of the projects even began to actively organize coalitions with other organizations in the community, a task most postponed until the second year.

"Housekeeping tasks" are described as a major burden in the second half of the first year. Report writing - from advocates to supervisors; supervisors to administrators; administrators to funding agencies - is a constant source of irritation. This may be further exacerbated by the presence of outside evaluators who require additional reports or paperwork. In addition, proposals have to be prepared and submitted for refunding. For some projects, especially those without an explicit conceptual framework and a sense of "mission", much of these tasks are seen as an enormous burden. The reports often appear to be discrete; at other times they seem overlapping. There is little sense of progress and often, problems are so varied and overwhelming that the recording process appears to highlight them and the function of feedback from such reports is lost.

By the end of the first year, these projects tend to be somewhat ambivalent about what has been achieved. Half state that the projects are still not fully operational. Almost all find it necessary to redefine their goals, narrowing them down, making them more precise and limiting the number of targets addressed. Similarly, all are concerned with the need to re-think strategies previously employed and restructure or redesign the nature of the program generally. Four projects in this category have begun to implement case advocacy and one has initiated class advocacy. However, most feel that they are under pressure to provide direct service and thus, advocacy activities receive less emphasis than anticipated.

Confusion about staff roles is pervasive. In one program, although the director and assistant director have a sense of achievement vis-a-vis the community and other agencies, they are constantly grappling with low staff morale. Staff have been largely under-utilized throughout the life of the project, and have little sense of involvement, utility, value or achievement; thus a diminishing sense of commitment to the project. In one other, some of the staff roles have been redefined several times. Where role and function is clear, within a legal component for example, enthusiasm and a strong sense of achievement exist. For example, one project that has a lawyer on its staff is among the very few that have implemented class advocacy on a regular basis. On the other hand, where roles are unclear and frequently restructured and redefined, staff have little sense of direction and morale is low. In two projects where the major target for change is the school, confusion about staff roles remained so pervasive that a formal contract was drawn up specifying the duties and obligations of both teachers and advocates. In one of these, several months into the project's second year, there was still no agreement by the teachers to this contract.

Finally, there is the third and smallest group, that employs the approach termed structured programming. As a whole, this group took a more deliberate approach to phasing in the operations of the project. Most of them have as directors, people who were heavily involved in planning the program as well as operating it. As one project director said, "creating an organizational structure is the first task for the project, but it is essential that it not be created in a vacuum." It had to be a structure that would facilitate goal achievement and thus, each component part needed to be carefully selected with an eye to fitting together board, staff, consultants, so that as a collective entity it would be more effective than as individuals. Although no project managed to obtain exactly the staff desired, these were more likely to than others.

All of these placed a particularly heavy emphasis on staff training involving about two to three months. Some implemented training programs on an annual basis. One project, using volunteers, carefully developed a training program for them also. All stressed the use of specialist staff or outside consultants (lawyers, child psychologists, social workers) for formal training purposes. In one project lawyers were employed to instruct paraprofessional staff in the details of the state legislative code regarding schooling (e.g., under what circumstances can students be suspended? For how long a period? With what kind of notification to students and parents? Under what circumstances is corporal punishment permitted? With what kind of restrictions?) Other experts were used to teach staff about the structure of the school system so that they would know where in the administrative hierarchy intervention could be most effective. The overall objective here was to provide staff with necessary training to act as advocates for students.

Staff tended to be clear about their roles and openly expressed a sense of achievement. In none were any services provided before a minimum of six months after funding and for the most part, once begun, they expanded gradually with a regular review of programming, initiating changes where necessary.

Characteristic of this group is a sense of "mission" mentioned by all staff including principal investigators, directors and line workers. Each was clear about the project's objectives and strongly identified with achieving them. Although all of these have boards, membership is appointed rather than elected, and only three are really active and have some input into policy. Two boards are composed solely of community elite and professionals; however, the executive director and staff of these projects are all indigenous youths, thus ensuring identification with the community as well as involvement of the community in the project. Another board includes both community professionals and lay people. In each project, board members are selected for their special commitment to the project.

In some, case advocacy activities were implemented by the eighth month of the project's life while in others, not until the end of the first year. In all they are an integral part of the program even when direct services are provided also. Class advocacy was implemented by the end of the first year in only one project. However, in both this one as well as the earlier mentioned project in which class advocacy was implemented by this time, a lawyer is a regular member of the staff. Case and class advocacy are integrated within the project but segregated by roles with different people implementing each. Targets addressed by these projects are fewer in number than for others; they tend to be the most specialized projects, specifically concentrating either on the school system or on the juvenile justice system. Housekeeping tasks are described as less onerous for this group. Perhaps because they are viewed as documenting the progress and achievements of the project, they are employed for feedback purposes.

OPERATIONS

Since this study is concerned with valid child advocacy projects, the period of time in which a project becomes operational is assumed to begin when case or class advocacy activities are first provided. Projects are defined as "fully operational" when advocacy activities characterize the major program component (more than one half of project activities) and a similar portion of staff time. At the onset of this study, none of these projects were more than two and a half years old (since funding), and only three were more than one and a half years old. Of the twenty-three projects studied, only eleven had begun activities associated with operationalizing projects. Only two have completed this process (the two oldest) while one other may be approaching completion. Thus, at most, three projects have reached the status termed "fully operational." With such limited experience, whatever is said about the activities composing this phase is necessarily tentative. Some indication of how projects proceeded from their beginning activities to becoming operational may be seen in the table below.

By the middle of the second year, two projects are already expressing their doubts about their continued existence. Several continue to be concentrated on organizational problems: directors changed, staff resigned or were discharged, boards were reorganized. In these projects, efforts continue to be focused on internal problems and directors express frustration with their inability to address programming issues. A few others are having obvious difficulties in their relationships with the community. This is revealed in a variety of ways: services may not be adequately utilized by the community (e.g., few referrals are made); the project may have no constituency (where there are boards, membership is inactive and new members are hard to recruit; few people in the community may know of the project); advocate practitioners may get caught up in providing a great deal of direct

TABLE

HOW PROJECTS BEGAN, THE PROCESS BY WHICH THEY WERE ESTABLISHED AND THEIR OPERATIONAL STATUS

HOW PROJECTS BEGAN	INDIVIDUAL INITIATIVES			FUNDING AGENCY INITIATIVES			SPONSORING AGENCY INITIATIVES			FUNDING AGENCY AUTHORIZATION		
TOTAL NO. PROJECTS BEGUN: 23	8			7			4			4		
HOW PROJECTS[a] WERE ESTABLISHED	C	D	S	C	D	S	C	D	S	C	D	S
TOTAL NO. ESTABLISHED:23	2	2	4	2[b]	5	-	4	-	-	4	-	-
NO. PROJECTS BEGINNING OPERATIONS:11	-	2	4	-	3	-	-	-	-	2[bc]	-	-
NO. ATTAINING FULLY OPERATIONAL STATUS:2	-	-	2[d]	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

[a] As indicated, projects were established in one of three ways.*

[b] These are new components of existing programs.

[c] These are two of the youngest projects in the study.

[d] These are two of the oldest projects in the study.

*Crash Programming (C)
Developmental Programming (D)
Structured Programming (S)

service which may be needed but is not advocacy; other agencies and potential clients perceive the project as a direct service agency rather than as an advocacy project. Advocacy - case or class - becomes increasingly difficult to implement Subsequent conflict may arise within the staff or between staff and administration and/or board.

For eight other projects, this period is one in which the organization itself functions with minimal difficulty and the project turns its efforts outward. Access services continue to be provided but with an increased awareness of the need to remain informed about community resources and to follow-up on individual referrals. Case advocacy is implemented with growing frequency and referrals to the project increase as credibility becomes more widespread. Consumers hear about the project and view it as an effective resource; other institutions experience interventive efforts by project staff. Extensive knowledge of the community, especially of the relevant target system is defined as crucial in this period, by several directors. One project that was addressing a widely dispersed group of targets began to focus its interventive efforts on one particular target.

During this period, many of these projects begin to seek out other organizations and groups to join with them in taking positions and actions on common problems. The development of coalitions is identified as essential by those who recognize that certain problems cannot be addressed by only one organization in the community. For example, a gluesniffing problem among youths may require action by parent groups, the school, local business organizations, as well as the city legislature. Changing laws may require activity by a variety of organizations around the state. In general, the projects are much better known by the end of the second year; one even received nationwide publicity about its accomplishments.

Several became increasingly concerned with developing representative community boards, however, this is as likely to be done because of funding agency pressures as because it is essential for effective implementation of the program. With growing recognition of what is realistic and possible to achieve and what is not, goals are often redefined again and made more precise. There is beginning concern with evaluation and a desire to verify self-perceptions of effectiveness.

By the middle of the second year, efforts at replication (or as one director terms it "exportation") were begun by three projects. One has been sufficiently successful that eight individuals in different communities have been interested in replicating the original model. Those sites described as "least successful" are those where there was failure to follow the model staffing pattern - using indigenous community youth as directors and staff and committed professionals and influential lay people as board members.' The most "successful" are described by the director as those with widespread community support and indigenous leadership. In another, a satellite project was established and closed after six months and the project's demise and the community's failure to utilize its services was ascribed (by the director and assistant director) to the fragmented nature of the community, the absence of any constituency for the program, the difficulty in obtaining competent indigenous staff and the weakness of project leadership. A third project is only now in the process of replicating its program in several different sites; it remains to be seen whether it can accomplish this satisfactorily. One other project was asked by a nearby community to help and establish something similar. It did a feasibility study of the community and concluded that the absence of community support and indigenous leadership precluded such a development at that time. The director recommended that efforts at organizing the community and involving community groups in a planning process be implemented before attempting to establish such a project. Developing proposals for satellite projects and other related projects for new services such as alternative schools, halfway houses, youth employment programs, occurs during this period also.

For three operational projects anticipating provision of class advocacy as well as case advocacy, such intervention is implemented by the end of the second year. Although sixteen projects state that they intend to provide class advocacy, only four have done so. Where class advocacy is provided, it is generally by different components within the project; for example, staff may do case advocacy while directors do class advocacy (this has other implications to be discussed later). Projects exhibit a new type of problem in this period. Funding agencies may pressure for rapid expansion or replication of the project. Directors of projects receiving widespread publicity may find themselves torn between moving into a larger arena or concentrating on the immediate concerns of their own project and the community it addresses.

Only three of the projects in the sample had reached their third year of operation when studied in the field and one of these has continued as a volunteer effort and never received formal funding. At this point, the primary concern for these projects is the question of their survival. One of these three is a federally funded research and demonstration project that has been notified that it will not be refunded beyond its thirty-third month although it has been considered unusually successful by the community as well as by independent evaluators, influential professionals and lay people throughout the country. Much of the director's current effort is going into seeking alternative funds either for this project or developing other proposals for new funding. Staff are concerned, thinking about looking for other employment, frustrated and expressing a sense of impotence. "If a project is a proven success, why let it die?"

they ask.

A second project, supported wholly by voluntary funds and with strong ties to the business community and private philanthropy, is facing similar problems. Private funding on a continuing basis is difficult to generate; one satellite project has managed to become self-supporting after two and a half years, raising funds from within its local community. However, others have not reached that point yet. The central organization is actively seeking federal funding now but has not as yet obtained any. Among other approaches, one of its confederate group is considering a reorganization and expansion of its board, in order to include more local business elite in an effort at expanding local fund raising. Another has decided to employ a "development officer" whose special job it would be to do fund raising outside of the local community.

These three projects are all implementing both case and class advocacy. However, one finds a conflict between the two and has decided to concentrate on the former. Two project directors state that as their advocacy activities increase and become obviously effective their constituency expands but target institutions begin to view them more as a threat. All stress the need to straddle a fine line between continuing their efforts at affecting change at the same time as they minimize direct confrontation techniques and reject strong adversarial positions. Concentration on a limited number of targets, a thorough knowledge of the target system addressed, fact finding and documentation of every issue requiring advocacy, and substantive expertise are identified as essential for effective negotiation and persuasion. Within this context, direct confrontation techniques are employed less and defined as less necessary. Class advocacy, derived from an analysis of case advocacy activities, with extensive documentation of individual cases and support for positions taken, is increasingly implemented. Possible use of legal action, in particular, class action suits, are seen as an effective back-up for class advocacy.

Concern with internal organizational structure is minimal; concern with evaluation is high in order to document achievements proving the value of the project. However, primary concern is survival - the search for continued existence.

SUMMARY

To sum up, in this chapter we have looked at three projects that are less than one year old; sixteen that are between one and one and one half; and four between two and two and a half years old. All, by the very fact that they received funding or made the decision to establish a project, have completed their beginning activities. Twelve are still in the process of getting established. Employing the criterion of beginning case or class advocacy in some form as demonstrating the onset of operationalizing a project, eleven have begun this process and of these one has almost completed it. Finally, two projects are considered to be fully operational.

In general, it appears to take six to twelve months to plan a project. Activities that seem most characteristic of this beginning phase include: the identification and diagnosis of a need or a problem in a community; the identification of an objective; selection of an auspice; the design of a structure. Where there seems to be more variance is with regard to the following: how projects begin; the type of leadership demonstrated; the development of a conceptual framework; the participation and involvement of consumers, experts, other lay people and community organizations; who develops the formal proposal where one is submitted and the length of time between submission and actual funding.

Establishing a project takes about one year. Once the process is begun, structuring the organization should be completed at the end of about six months. That is, an office should be obtained, most staff, in particular administrative, supervisory and line staff, hired and trained, and some community activities completed. Beginning in these first six months but completed by the end of the first year, first targets and strategies are generally identified, clientele and referral sources contacted, specialist staff hired, first services provided and community participation expanded. If an appointed board is planned, this too is generally organized, convened and meeting regularly by the end of the first year.

For example, by the twelfth month, twenty-two projects were providing some form of direct service. Of these, twelve were providing access services and six had begun data collection or a community survey. Eleven projects had begun provision of case advocacy. Of this group, one began class advocacy also and one other began class advocacy first (through its legal component).

The greatest variance occurred during this period with regard to whether the project director hired was someone who had been actively involved in the beginning activities; whether or not specialized professional staff were hired (lawyers, psychologists, teachers, social workers, researchers); the nature and extent of staff training; whether boards were elected or appointed, advisory or policy-making, active or inactive; the extent of staff turnover; whether or not administrative structure, staffing patterns, programs generally, were reorganized and why; whether roles were redefined and why; the number and dispersion of targets addressed and whether or not case or class advocacy was provided and when.

Operationalizing a project begins in the first half of the second year of a project's life. By the eighteenth month, case advocacy is provided regularly and where there is a legal component in a project, class advocacy is provided also. During the remainder of the second year project goals are refined further and beginning efforts are made regarding the formation of coalitions composed of other organizations or groups in the community. Where boards are elected, these are convened and are meeting regularly by the end of this period. Some interest in evaluation - the documentation of achievements and feedback related to the impact of project activities begins to be evinced at the end of the second year.

Finally, although the experience is limited here and conclusions are at best tentative, projects appear to be fully operational sometime during their third year. Where feasible, some may begin to attempt replications or the establishment of satellite or duplicate projects. Three have begun this, however, thus far, only one has been successful. It generated the establishment of eight community projects, seven of which have been in existence between one and two years. At this point, the few projects that have lasted this long are once again concentrated on problems of organizational maintenance, in particular, a search for additional funding in order to ensure continuity.

The next chapter will begin with an attempt at further conceptualization of the developmental phases of these projects. This will provide a basis for first efforts at comparing and contrasting the activities characterizing projects which are obvious failures and those which are ongoing community child advocacy projects. Following this, the focus will shift to the issue of criteria, indicators and evaluation points.

CHAPTER V

PLANNING, INITIATION, IMPLEMENTATION, CONTINUITY: A CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK FOR PROJECT DEVELOPMENT

The last chapter described the nature and extent of the activities performed by child advocacy projects during their first two and one half years and gave some indication of when these occurred and how they appeared to cluster in certain periods of time. This chapter will be devoted to developing a conceptual framework for the process. Conceptualization of developmental stages and tasks is essential to derive an evaluative instrument that may be applicable to all community child advocacy projects, not just the group studied. The chapter begins, therefore, with a review and discussion of the literature conceptualizing organizational development, to see if any existing theoretical schemes are relevant for ordering the process in child advocacy projects. Since the use of a familiar vocabulary will facilitate understanding, communication and the use of the evaluative instrument, utilization of existing concepts is preferable to developing new ones. There may be some difficulty in applying these theoretical frameworks to the data because the existing schemes were developed deductively rather than inductively. Thus, where theory does not fit reality, certain concepts may not be useful. Regardless, exploration of existing theory is essential to select out what is most relevant for what has now been described empirically.

SOME CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORKS FOR ORGANIZATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Earlier (Chapter II), mention was made of an approach to differential evaluation that appeared to have relevance and applicability for child advocacy projects.[1] This conceptual framework identified three stages for program evaluation: program initiation; program contact; and program implementation. Since this approach is derived from studies of organizational development, a summary of this literature will be helpful before assessing its possible relationship to what has been derived empirically from the projects.

Hage and Aiken, from whose work the above framework is derived, actually identify four phases in program development[2]: evaluation, initiation, implementation and routinization. Evaluation encompasses the identification and study of an existing need or situation and a diagnosis of the problem. Initiation involves designing the new program: identifying objectives and alternative strategies for achieving these objectives, searching for resources - human, financial and physical - to support the proposed plan. Implementation, the third stage, involves taking the plan as designed and putting it into action, making it operational. Finally, routinization involves stabilization of the program (implied here is achievement of objectives, institutionalization of the program, and the ability to continue even if and when leadership changes).

---

[1] Tripodi, Fellin and Epstein, op. cit.

[2] Hage and Aiken, op. cit.

In contrast to this, Lawrence and Lorsch suggest five stages[1]: diagnosis (identification of a problem or need and determination of the relevant causative factors); design (delineation of objectives and of an organizational structure to implement them); action planning (the development of alternative strategies and change methods for achieving the above objectives and determining their sequential implementation); implementation (translation of the plan into action); and evaluation (the end of the first cycle or organizational development and the beginning of the next; the comparison of the actual results with what was anticipated and diagnosing the variance and its causes).

As indicated earlier, the framework developed by Tripodi, et. al., seemed highly relevant, initially, to the current study. However, since this study was deliberately designed to employ a developmental methodology - to study a developmental process - it seemed appropriate to view the life history of these projects empirically first, seeing whether there were natural stages through which projects developed, before applying a conceptual framework. Empirical analysis of the material and consideration of the conceptual frameworks reported in the literature suggested that the best fit might be found by employing a three stage model involving these categories: Planning, Initiation, Implementation. What follows reveals how this model evolved and why these concepts were selected.

---

[1] Lawrence and Lorsch, op. cit.

Planning

In reviewing the creation of these child advocacy projects, it is immediately apparent that all activities related to beginning a new project involved a period of time and a cluster of tasks quite distinct from the actual operation of a project. The distinctive nature of this phase is heightened for eighteen of these projects because this process culminated in the preparation of a formal proposal. In addition, for most, there was a hiatus between the completion of planning and a beginning effort at establishing a project. For three to six months, almost all activity on the project ceased, while planners waited for notification of grant awards. Thus, for many projects there is a fairly clear cut line of demarcation between planning and establishing a project. Indeed, if this hiatus is too prolonged, some regression may be observed in later development. For example, these first activities provide a certain momentum for establishing a project. If too long a period of time elapses, the developers may become involved in other activities; their commitment to the project may be diluted; similarly, community interest may shift or wane; unforeseen factors or problems may arise.

In effect, the proposal as a formal document reflects an holistic process. Where the plan is not written down, this process may be more difficult to assess; regardless, this then appears to be the first stage in the creation of a child advocacy project.

For the group studied, the process was generated by one of four factors: the concerns, efforts and ideas of individuals; the availability of new funds for a specific type of project; the efforts of the sponsoring organization to obtain additional funds for its own use; a specific grant of money from a funding agency for the development of a plan.

Once action is taken to begin a new child advocacy project, subsequent tasks accomplished during this period include:

- The determination and documentation or a need or problem in the community.

- The delineation of a specific target community and a target population.

- The participation of a wide range of interest groups in the community: consumers, experts, influential lay people, organizations.

- Specification of objectives or goals.

- The choice of targets for intervention, levels of intervention and interventive methods and techniques.

- The design of an appropriate structure.

- Selection of an auspice or obtaining the support of the existing administrative structure for a new program component.

- The search for funds.

In attempting to conceptualize this process Lawrence and Lorsch identify three separate stages which all relate to these activities: diagnosis, design and action-planning. Diagnosis involves determination of needs or problems: design involves specification of goals, process and structure; action-planning involves identification of targets for change, change methods and interventive strategies, and planning for the sequential development of implementation. Hage and Aiken include all of the above in the stage called evaluation as well as in a portion of their second stage, initiation. Tripodi includes these within the stage of program initiation, but adds such other activities as obtaining physical, financial and human resources in addition to establishing an organizational structure. In viewing the life history of these projects, this last group of activities appears at a distinctly different period of time. Williams refers to this cluster as program design, however, this seems to be too static a concept to encompass the variety of processes and activities accomplished in this phase.[1] None of the stages conceptualized above seems to appropriately capture the whole process followed by these projects.

In contrast to the above, Kahn's planning paradigm does seem relevant for conceptualizing this phase of project development.[2] Included in his concept of the planning process are: planning instigators, exploration of relevant realities and preferences, definition of the planning task, policy formulation and programming. Planning instigators are what stimulate and initiate the planning process.

His concept of the definition of the planning task encompasses a process by which objectives are arrived at inductively, through the exploration of relevant facts and an assessment of values and preferences. An adequate investigation implies the presence of those activities identified in the last chapter as integral to beginning a child advocacy project: widespread involvement of the relevant community, consumers as well as well as appropriate experts. Essential to the careful definition of the planning task is the integration of facts, preferences, and political feasibility in order to determine viable objectives. In fact, according to Kahn, it is this inductive process by which objectives are defined rather than the arbitrary determination of objectives and subsequent search for solutions that is so crucial to this phase. In effect, clear definition of the planning task delineates the mission of the project, an essential component of planning as well as program development.

---

[1] Williams, Social Policy Research, pp. 4-5.

[2] Kahn, Theory and Practice of Social Planning.

Policy formulation provides a general guide to action. It is analogous to the action planning phase of Lawrence and Lorsch and involves the identification of targets for intervention, levels of intervention and interventive strategies. Finally, programming focuses on designing the program, which then has to be made operational.

Thus, all tasks already identified as integral to the first phase in the creation of child advocacy projects, may be encompassed within Kahn's concept of planning. As mentioned earlier, for most of the projects studied, the process took between six and twelve months. Whether or not the amount of time spent in planning relates to the adequacy of the plan, or what the critical variables are in this phase remain as yet unidentified.

One final note about the planning phase. One task, obtaining community participation and involvement, was described as "difficult to achieve" in certain types of communities, by several directors. In particular, those communities which are characterized as fragmented, having no sense of community identity or cohesion, with no indigenous leadership or community organizations, require initial effort at organizing before they can be mobilized to support or even utilize a child advocacy project. Communities that have seen a large number of federal programs come and go tend to be equally suspicious of a new project. (Such hostility to federal programs as well as other consequences of short-term federal funding, will be discussed further, in Chapter VIII) Special efforts are required to arouse the interest and support of such communities. Communities which have been subjected to several research studies by universities or teaching hospitals seem to be equally hostile to projects sponsored by such institutions. In addition, advocacy interventions which begin with a survey of community needs often engender immediate negative reaction by communities that have been studied and restudied and want to see action and not further study. For such communities, a plan involving an initial survey may immediately "turn off" the community and result in limited involvement and support. Finally, communities which are substantially deprived economically - with extensive poverty and high unemployment rates - often viewed child advocacy projects as irrelevant to their priorities. Projects did not receive their support unless goals were relatively precise and clearly relevant to immediate needs. Thus, the nature of the target community may need to be carefully considered when planning a child advocacy project.

Initiation

The second stage in the development of child advocacy projects begins for most when they obtain funding. Activities related to establishing a project begin when a decision is made to go ahead either because it has been funded; it has been authorized to plan by a funding source or sponsoring agency; or a group of people have decided to organize a project. For the three projects without formal funding, two had staff assigned to begin operations and one decided to proceed on a volunteer basis.

This phase encompasses part of what Tripodi and Hage and Aiken term Program Initiation - the search for financial, physical and human resources to implement the proposed plan. Similarly, it encompasses all of what Lawrence and Lorsch call Implementation or translating the plan into action.. It begins where Kahn's concept of the programming phase of planning ends - in other words, after the program is designed - with the first efforts at operationalizing the program.

In reviewing the experience of child advocacy projects, it appears that there is a definite distinction both in time, focus, nature of activities and of the effort expended by the staff, between getting the program organized and established and its actual operation. Williams uses the term project organization to describe the time when the project concentrates on internal organizational development, placing less emphasis (although some is essential) on external development.

It involves the recruitment and hiring of administrative, supervisory and line staff (generally this is done sequentially); obtaining an office; training staff, recruiting and organizing a board; identifying and mobilizing a constituency; contacting other agencies and explaining the nature of the new project; identifying short-term goals and objectives and ranking them; specifying first targets for intervention and first strategies.

Some of these tasks are sequential (e.g., hiring an administrative staff who recruit, then hire line staff; then train staff); some are simultaneous (while staff are recruited, hired, and trained, the community is involved through the process of recruitment of staff and board members as well as through the use of other agency representatives as resource people for training.)

Program Contact is the second stage described by Tripodi, who employs it as a separate phase for evaluation purposes. In studying the life history of these projects, it is obvious that this phase involving contact with potential program beneficiaries, is not chronologically distinct from other stages. Quite the contrary, in several projects, what might be described as consumer participation or consumer involvement is integrated into every phase from planning to operationalizing a project. Thus, treating it as separate and distinct, indeed as anything else but a task for each phase, would be both dysfunctional and invalid.

For child advocacy projects, this phase, termed Project Initiation, involves both structuring the organization as well as initiating first actions and services. Among the major tasks addressed are:

- Integrating the organizational mission into the framework of the project. (The commitment of leadership to project objectives; training of staff).

- Establishing an organizational structure that will facilitate achievement of objectives. (Hiring staff, establishing boards, defining roles)

- Obtaining sanction and legitimacy for the project (the identification, organization, and mobilization of a constituency, accomplished by such means as: recruiting and hiring indigenous staff, organizing boards composed of community representatives - lay and/or professional; establishing linkages with other community organizations.)

- Specifying goals, in particular first targets for intervention and interventive strategies.

- Beginning provision of services.

This phase takes about one year to complete. In general structuring the organization (obtaining an office, hiring staff, training staff, first efforts at community involvement) takes about six to eight months to complete.

Identification of first targets and strategies may begin during this period, however, it is completed and services and other related activities are first provided after another six months.

Implementation

Operationalizing new projects, in other words completing activities related to the initiation phase as well as the next group of activities, was inevitably longer than project directors anticipated. Sarason, in his study of the creation of new settings, comments:

> I have never talked to a leader of a new setting who did not say that he had underestimated how long it would take for the setting to become operational. Some of the leaders said they had vastly underestimated how long it would take and that this had adverse personal and organizational consequences.[1]

The start-up time for projects located in poor communities, with indigenous paraprofessional staff may take longer than anticipated because staff lack expertise and experience and require additional time for training to develop this.

Projects that have an innovative conceptual framework also appear to require longer to implement than more conventional programs. Related to this, projects that provide traditional case services tend to begin service provision earlier than those that concentrate on advocacy activities. In general, communicating this new conceptual framework to staff, training them in new roles, explaining the new project to the community and finally, translating it all into action, requires adequate if not extensive time.

---

[1] Sarason, op. cit., p. 201, Footnote.

Finally, projects that have widespread community involvement in the planning and initiation phases, and projects in which staff as well as directors participate in decision-making, all take more time to become operational than others. Whether or not these factors also appear to result in more effective implementation once that stage is achieved, remains to be seen.

Implementation is defined by Lawrence and Lorsch as the phase in which the action plan is translated into action; by Hage and Aiken as the stage in which the program becomes operational; by Tripodi, similarly, when programs are fully operational and outcomes can be identified and measured.

Similarly, for child advocacy projects, implementation is the stage in which the project becomes operational. The major characteristic that distinguishes this from the earlier phase is that the stress here is on the project's external relationships, rather than on organizational maintenance. It begins once the project is fully structured and beginning to provide service and ends when the full complement of advocacy services planned for are provided; when those projects defining "systems intervention" or class advocacy as a goal, are in fact able to implement it; when the project's major effort is on programming rather than organizational maintenance; when more than half of staff time is going toward the provision of advocacy services; when advocacy activities constitute a major portion of the program; when the project can be successfully duplicated elsewhere; when goals are sufficiently specified and defined in measurable terms.

Among the tasks for this phase are:

- Retaining commitment of leadership and staff to the project's mission.
- Strengthening and expanding the sanction for advocacy.
- Effective and efficient use of project energy: that is concentration on advocacy activities and limiting the number and dispersion of targets addressed and strategies employed.
- Provision, where planned, of case advocacy.
- Provision, where planned, of class advocacy.
- Integration of a series of devices to ensure consumer and community accountability.
- Beginning efforts at replication of a project.
- Documentation of achievements.

Implementation for those child advocacy projects completing this phase, begins sometime during the second year after funding and takes approximately one to two years to complete. Only two of the projects studied currently appear to have achieved fully operational status and those are two of the oldest projects studied. Even they have expressed some question as to whether they have really obtained that status. (Indeed, an interesting note is that directors of those projects that appeared furthest along towards implementation tended to raise the most interesting questions about the operational status of their own projects.)

This implementation phase of project development is crucial for evaluation purposes since until this phase is completed, evaluation of project outcomes or impact is impossible. Williams stresses the importance of this process, saying:

> The question of implementation is one of the most fundamental of all the issues facing a large-scale organization. In its most general form, an inquiry about implementation capability (or, more accurately, specification-implementation) seeks to determine whether an organization can bring together men and material in a cohesive organizational unit and motivate them in such a way as to carry out the organization's stated objectives.[1]

Whether or not a program ever achieves this stage of being "fully operational" (or fully implemented), is the crucial question for outcome evaluation purposes. Determination of what factors influence the project's capacity for reaching this stage is thus of enormous importance. Williams suggests the importance of program design and specificity, the development of a sound organizational structure and the presence of competent leadership as criteria for evaluating this capacity.[1] In effect, he has introduced an initial list or prerequisites essential for program implementation. Viewed within the framework of a developmental process, as tasks for different phases within this process, one can study how this capacity develops - which factors contribute to its existence and which will impede its development.

---

[1] Williams, Social Policy Research, p. 144

Continuity

Finally, what happens once a project achieves this status and is defined as fully operational? How is effective performance demonstrated?

Lawrence and Lorsch describe a stage called routinization in which the developmental process achieves its objectives and seeks validation through identification of measures of performance or effectiveness. It is at this point that outcome or impact evaluation is viable.

There does not appear to be any such phase for the projects included in this study. As the period of formal funding comes to a close and often during the whole year prior to this, much of the project's effort is devoted to finding new sources of funding in order to stay alive. This fight for survival has overwhelmed at least one project, leaving staff frustrated and impotent and leaving a legacy of anger, bitterness, and resentment in the community. (For the fortunate few that manage to survive by scrounging additional funds from a variety of sources - and some of these were seen during the course of our last study - advocacy projects that are now five, six or seven years old - each year is viewed as a possible last and constant energy goes into fund raising.)

---

[1] *Ibid.*, pp. 144-145

Only two of the projects included in this study are at this stage; and it is highly probable that funding will end for one just as it achieves it. Since short-term funding is characteristic of most federal projects, and of all child advocacy projects, a major issue for all of these is the inappropriate time frame employed for outcome evaluation. As evidenced by this group, projects can rarely become fully operational in much less than two and a half years and outcome and impact evaluations cannot be implemented with valid expectation of measurable results before this time.

Summary

In summary, this chapter has reviewed existing theories of organizational development and selected those concepts which seem most relevant for the current study. Three developmental stages have been identified: planning, initiation and implementation; and the major tasks for each phase have been described. A fourth phase, continuity, has been suggested, however, none of the projects in this study have reached this stage. Although this may be a consequence of the age of the projects included in this study, it is quite possible that the nature of the advocacy process is such that project continuity is neither feasible nor desirable. On the other hand, it is equally possible that the nature of available funding precludes project continuity. Data available from this study does not permit any conclusions here. Based on these phases and their related tasks, the next chapter will attempt to identify developmental standards and tentative criteria for evaluating child advocacy projects at each stage.

CHAPTER VI

DEVELOPMENT OF AN INSTRUMENT FOR DIFFERENTIAL EVALUATION

Although outcome and impact studies face obvious problems, an extensive body of theory and knowledge already exists regarding this approach to evaluation. Assuming the validity of the definition of child advocacy developed earlier (see monograph) such evaluation studies would require the translation of this definition into objective, measurable criteria. For example, potential measures of impact for class advocacy, might be: changed laws, revised budgets, personnel change; for case advocacy, these might be: service obtained for a child who has been refused service, reinstatement of a student who has been inappropriately suspended from school.

The difficulty in using such impact measures early in the history of child advocacy projects is that when one looks at child advocacy projects in "real life," they take much longer to develop than most researchers, administrators, and project directors realize, and certainly much longer than is generally anticipated when the project first begins. Impact studies at this point in time would make no sense for almost all of the projects studied, yet obviously it is essential to have some idea of how well they are doing en route: How far along is a project to becoming operational?

How does it compare with other similar projects at the same point in time? What is the likelihood of its becoming an "effective" child advocacy project? For federal agencies such information is crucial, since decisions must be made annually regarding refunding of projects, or directing projects to make changes in programs, leadership, auspices, if they appear necessary - even though impact and effectiveness measures would be premature at the point when the decision needs to be made.

Thus, the issue becomes: how does one evaluate a child advocacy project after six or twelve or eighteen months? What criteria can be employed that would permit such interim evaluation? Essential for the development of such interim "process" criteria, is a definition of what ultimately is a "good," "effective," or "successful" fully mature child advocacy project. The present study represents an attempt at developing such criteria inductively. Since very few of these projects are actually fully operational, it is particularly difficult at this point to identify criteria suggesting "impact" success and to work backwards with great precision. However, if we can differentiate "the possibly successful" from "the clearly unsuccessful" projects, we may be able to formulate criteria of danger or failure relevant to those stages of organizational development in which impact studies would be premature. For this purpose, although it is difficult as yet to arrive at any completely firm, positive judgements regarding successful child advocacy projects, one can make a rough categorization of "failure," by identifying the projects that are obviously unsuccessful. For example, the directors of three projects openly acknowledged that their projects were not child advocacy at all; two others have readily admitted they have no identifiable program after over one year, and one of these is providing no service at all; three more have stated that their projects are "in difficulty," are unclear as to the cause but have doubts about the value and continuity of their enterprise.

In short, for a first approximation of "failure," there are eight projects, as follows:

Non-Advocacy Projects	3
Projects with No Program	2
Projects in Difficulty	3

Although the non-child advocacy projects and those with no service or program after one year, are obvious failures, the third category is less clear-cut. Acknowledgement of difficulty may be a function of a project director's honesty, thus, these projects may be no less successful than others, just more open about admitting it. Regardless, the group does provide a point of departure for further analysis, for seeking indicators of what is (or was) to come.

Identification of these eight as "failures" leaves a group of fifteen projects which by default would be considered more or less successful or at least, preliminarily, as "non-failures." Since none of the eight projects by definition has reached the third phase of development, implementation, nothing can be learned about that phase from this group. However, if one reviews the life history of these eight up until that point, and compares the activities performed by them with those of the "non-failures," one might begin to hypothesize about some possible correlates of failure and some tentative indicia of difficulty in each phase - some tentative prognosticators of problems in later phases.

ACTIVITIES CHARACTERISTIC OF EIGHT "FAILURES" DURING THE PLANNING AND INITIATION PHASES

Non-Advocacy Projects

Of the three projects that acknowledged the inappropriateness of the child advocacy label, one was labeled as an advocacy project by the funding agency, unbeknownst to the project. It is a research and demonstration project that provides day care for the infants of teenage mothers. Neither in the proposal, in actual practice, nor in an interview with the former project director is there any mention of child advocacy. The funding agency's purpose in categorizing this project as "child advocacy" is unclear. However, the obvious inappropriateness of the categorization is apparent as early as in the formal proposal. The absence of any reference to advocacy, in any material related to the planning of the project let alone in actual practice, would immediately exclude it from any evaluative study of child advocacy projects.

The second is a family advocacy project in which the director stated that the label was affixed to the project by its sponsoring organization, a family service agency. The term "family advocate" is used in the proposal, but it is never defined. The role is described as traditional casework and the objectives specified in the proposal all relate to direct service provision and coordination. Neither the director of the project nor the "family advocate" was involved with the project when it was planned. Neither knew anything about how or by whom the proposal was prepared; therefore, neither knew whether any of the participants had any clear concept of advocacy or why the label was used. Both were totally unfamiliar with the concept or what its implications might be for programming. The project is a neighborhood service center, has been operating for about one and a half years. Advocacy activities as such are not defined as any part of the program, which provides information and referral services, counseling, tutoring and a variety of other services (e.g., employment counseling, food stamps, emergency public assistance).

The proposal for a third project does spell out an advocacy concept, identifies a role for older youth advocating for younger, and describes a training program to prepare inexperienced youths for this role. Neither the director nor the assistant director was involved in the planning phase. The sponsoring agency, which had first sought funding for the project, was in the process of political reorganization and thus, no effort was made to establish the project for one year subsequent to funding. No staff, administrative or otherwise, were hired until then. During the initiation phase, the training program was first implemented, then changed and then partially eliminated. In particular, the focus on advocacy was eliminated. It was described by the director as not really relevant to the core of the program which provides recreational, tutoring and counseling services. In addition, a major objective of this delinquency prevention project as stated in the proposal, was the active involvement of youth in planning and making policy for the project. This was to be implemented first by the establishment of an advisory board composed of members elected from local high schools. After one and a half years, this board has not been organized because the youths are described as "too radical." Currently, efforts are being made to recruit board membership from among those youths regularly attending the various project centers.

Projects With No Program

One project is providing no services of any kind after almost one and a half years. The project was planned and the proposal developed by the staff member of a voluntary agency. She resigned just at the time that the proposal was funded. As proposed, the project was to organize parents, professionals, and influential lay people into a volunteer group which would focus on class advocacy in the community, in particular, around the mental health or related needs of children and their families. Monitoring of existing service systems, lobbying and related activities were to be implemented by citizen volunteers in a county that has been characterized as unusually "disparate" with a large population of physically mobile blue collar workers, a small upper middle class and professional group, and a largely underserviced and segregated chicano community. Several parents of handicapped children participated in the initial planning of the project. No other parent groups or organizations in the community were involved during this phase. In addition, the membership of the existing voluntary agency that was sponsoring the project, did not participate in the planning process and were unfamiliar with the proposal until it was funded.

Among the first activities performed once the project was initiated was the establishment of a policy-making board composed primarily of parents of handicapped children. However, the nature of the handicap varied. Intense conflict erupted among board members as to which handicap required greater advocacy. During the seven months that the board existed, no agreement was reached regarding priorities for the project; and finally, the director dissolved the board. Subsequently, a more widely representative board was appointed but there is still no agreement as to the first focus for this citizen group.

Another project was planned as an internal advocacy program, to monitor the services of a large institution as it related to children. The project has no separate funding; instead two staff members were assigned to it from other parts of the program. No specific problems were identified during the planning phase, but merely a general concern with the unresponsiveness of the institution to children's needs and their low priority generally. No objectives were ever identified, nor was there any indication of how services were to be changed if the staff identified problems or policies needing to be changed. No commitment of higher administration was ever obtained for the support or implementation of the project.

When the project was initiated, staff were left on their own to decide how to progress. No training, supervision, clarification of objectives or designation of strategies were forthcoming. Staff were unclear as to their roles and so was the target system that they were addressing. Thus, other staff perceived them as "spies for the administration" while the administration defined them as low-level staff and equated them with their peers. One staff member, after about one year, became completely involved with providing services on a single ward and its related out-patient service. The other, who was to be involved with neighborhood health service projects, is providing direct services there in addition to some community organizing activities. After the first year, the project staff no longer defined it as an effort at internal advocacy. The institution is described as "too large and too complex to be changed." None of what was planned has been initiated.

Projects in Difficulty

Three projects described themselves as "in difficulty" after sixteen months. One of these was designed to be a "community development model of child advocacy" which depended heavily on community participation and involvement for its initiation and implementation. A prior proposal had been prepared by the sponsoring organization with an objective and a design that the community supported. This proposal was rejected by the funding agency which then suggested that a proposal be submitted for a "community development model child advocacy project." A professional proposal writer was hired to prepare the proposal and it was subsequently submitted and approved for funding. No consumers, relevent groups, or organizations in the community were involved in the planning process and the principal investigator has described the proposal as "poorly designed" with broad, diffuse objectives and no clear indication as to how these were to be achieved. It was prepared to meet funding agency guidelines.

When the project was initiated, staff were trained within a few days and services were provided within the first few months. Staff were unclear as to objectives and roles; they tended to view the project as a source of employment. Services that are provided include information and referral, some counseling and some community organizing. When interviewed about advocacy activities, staff were unable to describe any case or class advocacy.

The last two projects are unusual for this category of "failures" in that they placed great stress on consumer involvement and participation during the planning phase. One is the project described earlier that assured the community of the establishment of a child advocacy project well before funds were obtained, organized elections for lay and professional board members and convened the board. Leadership was active throughout the planning process; there was widespread involvement of relevant interest groups in the community. The project's design is very similar to that of another child advocacy project in the same city, one that is included in the "non-failure" category. If anything, this project accomplished more numerous and more extensive activities than most of the other projects during the planning phase.

What happened during the initiation phase which thus far has precluded the project from becoming operational? First, leaders, who had been actively involved in planning the project, withdrew from the leadership role at the onset at that time. Close to one and a half years after funding, this project still was not operational. Only after additional time elapses will it be known whether this major administrative reorganization will facilitate the process of operationalizing the project.

The last project included in this group "in difficulty" is one in which the leaders worked closely with the major organization in the community to develop a proposal that would satisfy consumer needs and wants. The project is designed to implement changes in the local school system. The design of the project eschews a conflict model and employs instead a consensual-cooperative model for implementing such change. However, school administration and relevant personnel did not participate in planning the project. Neither during the planning phase nor during the initiation phase were objectives specified. A major problem for the project is that the community perceives it as functioning in an adversarial role vis a vis the school, and sees it as inadequate in this role; while the school views it as adjunctive to its system, and resists any efforts at intervention. Both project and school staff were unclear about advocacy staff roles, and after more than one year an impasse was reached. Concerted efforts were made to clarify staff roles; however, school staff still did not concur with those specified. Several months later, objectives and strategies still were not specified. One conclusion reached by project leadership is that the target is too powerful and of the initiation phase. Instead they assumed an advisory and consultant role. The elected board took on responsibility for making all policy for the project and recruited and hired the director and staff (although a full complement of staff was never hired during the first year). The project director employed was someone who had been completely unrelated to the planning process earlier and who was dominated by the board which continued to maintain complete responsibility for major policy decisions. Neither staff nor director had any input into decision making. Furthermore, the board itself was composed of members who had conflicting ideas about policy. No decisions were reached during the first year about action targets and strategies; staff were often given conflicting directions by the board and project director. The consequence was that most of the first year was spent coping with intra-organizational conflict. Although some information, referral and counseling services were provided, advocacy activities were not implemented and no clear objectives or priorities were ever delineated. Before the end of the first year, when it came time for elections to be held for the board, the principal investigator intervened. Several staff members were discharged; new ones hired; the remaining staff positions that had been open all year were filled; the board was left temporarily vacant; and the policy-making role was assumed by the principal investigator. After four months, a new board was elected including none of the earlier members. Only limited authority was assigned to it the strategies too diffuse for changing the school. An alternative conclusion is that the staff did not have the skills necessary to intervene in such a complex target system.

Based on the experience of this group of eight tentatively labeled "failures" the following summarizes the activities (or lack of activity) that appears to be characteristic. This list is organized in such a way as to indicate, first, how and when one can recognize that a project is not a child advocacy project; and second, what the indicia might be for "difficulty," "problems," or "failure" in either the planning or initiation phase.

INDICIA OF NON-ADVOCACY

In the Planning Phase

1) No use of the term "child" or "family advocacy" in the proposal, memorandum or other planning document.

2) No indication that any of the planners defined the project as a child advocacy project (e.g., a statement by the project director that child advocacy was never discussed as relevant to the project).

3) Use of the term "advocacy," but no definition of what is meant by this.

4) Inappropriate use of the term, for example, to describe traditional service roles or direct services.

5) Absence of any objectives related to advocacy.

In the Initiation Phase

6) The project director's ignorance of the meaning of child advocacy or its relevance for the project.

7) Elimination of that part of the program design which related to child advocacy (eliminating specific advocacy training; eliminating specific objectives related to advocacy).

8) Absence of any special training for advocacy staff, or any specified advocacy objectives.

INDICIA OF DIFFICULTY AT EACH PHASE (OR PROGNOSTICATORS OF PROBLEMS AT A FUTURE PHASE)

In the Planning Phase

1) Planning not begun by individual initiative(s). (For example, planning begun in response to funding agency initiatives, sponsoring agency initiatives, or funding agency grants.)

2) Need for child advocacy not widely recognized or accepted in the community.

3) Project poorly designed.

   a) no clear diagnosis of need or problem.
   b) poorly selected target community and target population.
   c) no conceptual framework for the project.
   d) no clear idea of what is meant by child advocacy.

4) Failure to involve all facets of the relevant community in planning for the project.

5) (For new components of existing projects only) Failure to obtain administrative support for a new program.

In the Initiation Phase

6) Project poorly structured:

   a) Project director not involved in planning project.
   b) No training for advocate staff (or only very brief training of one to two weeks).
   c) Failure to involve all facets of the relevant community.
   d) No further specification of objectives.
   e) No specification of advocacy targets.
   f) No specification of strategies.

7) Existence of numerous or extensive intra-organizational conflicts.

   a) Between director and board; director and staff; board and staff.
   b) Between project (director and/or board) and auspice.
   c) Among staff.

8) Inappropriate Selection of Targets

   a) too rigid or too powerful.
   b) too widely dispersed.
   c) non-advocacy.

9) Selection of strategies inappropriate to target.

10) Staff without skills to achieve goals or implement strategies.

11) Use of Crash Programming approach.

12) Absence of case or class advocacy.

TABLE

PRESENCE OF INDICIA OF DIFFICULTY IN FIVE PROJECTS DEFINED AS "FAILURES"*

Projects	Indicia of Difficulty**	
	In Planning	In Initiation
B	2,3,4	6,7,8,9,10,12
D	1,2,3,4	6,8,10,11,12
G	2,3,4,5	6,8,9,10,12
T	1	6,7,8,9,10,11,12
W	1,2,3,4	6,9,10,12

---

*The three projects already identified as "non-child advocacy projects" (A,C,M) have been eliminated from this analysis. From this point on, discussion of indicators, criteria and evaluation points will be limited to valid child advocacy projects.

**Numbers refer to listing on preceding pages.

TABLE

PRESENCE OF INDICIA OF DIFFICULTY IN FIFTEEN PROJECTS DEFINED AS NON-FAILURES

Projects	Indicia of Difficulty In Planning Phase	 In Initiation Phase
E***		
F***		
H	1	6,8,10
I	1,2,3	8,9,10,11
J**	1,2,3	6,8,10,11,12
K	1,2,3	8,9,11
L**	1,2,3,4	6,8,10,11,12
N***		
O***	4	10
P***		
Q	1,2	6,7,10,11
R***		
S**	1,2,4	6,7,8,10,11,12
U***		
V***		

* There are eleven indicia of failure for new projects in the group and twelve indicia of failure for new program components in old projects.

** These projects show as many indicia of difficulty as the "failure" group and are thus re-designated failures. See text.

*** These eight appear to be the most "successful" projects and this becomes our hypothesis.

The first table above indicates the number of indicia of difficulty characteristic of the five child advocacy projects tentatively defined as "failures." For new projects, the maximum number of such indicia in the planning phase is four (and for new components of existing projects, five); for the initiation phase there are seven indicia of difficulty (applicable to both new projects and new components of existing projects). The second table classifies by the presence or absence of such indicia the fifteen projects initially defined by default as "non-failures." Inspection leads to the tentative conclusion that the presence of three or more indicia of difficulty in the planning phase reveals problems in that phase and also seems to be correlated with problems in the initiation phase. In general, the presence of five or more indicia of difficulty in the initiation phase seems to indicate "failure" in that phase, and preclude program implementation.

Employing experimentally the combined total of eight or more indicia as characterizing projects which are "failures," and three or less as characterizing "success" we now add three projects from the original non-failure group and emerge with a group of eight "failures" out of a total group of twenty (B,D,G,J,L,S,T,W), eight "successes" (E,F,N,O,P,R,U,V), with few or no indicia of difficulty and four "uncertain" projects (H,I,K,Q).

ACTIVITIES CHARACTERISTIC OF THREE ADDITIONAL PROJECTS IDENTIFIED AS "FAILURE"

In reviewing the data in the table, three more projects (J,L,S) now emerge as apparent "failures." One is a project that was begun at the initiation of the sponsoring organization and is a revised version of an earlier component of that organization's program (the earlier project lost its funding). The proposal was prepared by a professional on the staff of the sponsoring organization, someone who was not involved subsequently with the establishment of the project. All of the staff were hired by the director of the auspice (although he had promised the elected community board of the earlier organization that it would function as the steering committee of the new project and have the right to do all hiring). The project director was not involved in the planning phase and was totally unfamiliar with the concept of child advocacy. All staff were hired within a few weeks and were largely inexperienced. No training was provided for them. The program was established by means of "crash programming." Targets and strategies were never specified and the project appears quite similar to any number of the community action programs of the sixties.

It is one of the two projects to have an elected, policy-making board. However, the sponsoring organization has never permitted the board to make policy nor is the project director given any real autonomy in making policy or in over-all project administration. The young high school members of the board never really participated on the board throughout the first year and the adult members found themselves increasingly in conflict with both the project director and the sponsoring organization. After less than one year, the board was dissolved and several months elapsed before a new one was reorganized. At the insistence of the funding agency, a new program component was added on to the project and the staff person responsible for it is responsible directly to the director of the sponsoring organization, not the project director. A class action suit, to obtain the elimination of the term "illegitimate" from birth certificates, has been initiated at the instigation of the legal consultant to the project. However, it appears largely irrelevant to a project purporting to be a youth advocacy project focused on legal rights of youth in relation to the school system and the juvenile justice system. Apart from this one case, neither case nor class advocacy has been implemented in almost one and one half years.

The second of these three additional "failures" is a volunteer project designed to follow a model that has received enormous attention within the last few years. It was begun at the initiation of its sponsoring organization which wanted to establish such a program as a pilot program. The organization instituted a study of the community to see if such a project was feasible. The final report of the study suggested that such a project might be successful but definitely not in the community studied because it was hostile to the sponsoring organization and to its presence in that community. Regardless of this recommendation, the organization went ahead and hired someone to write a proposal, submitted it, had it approved for funding, hired a director and established the project still in that same community. The director is young, inexperienced and unfamiliar with the community. The staff are young volunteers; they have been difficult to recruit and no training or supervision is provided them. Local agencies that are the sole source of referrals for the project have not been particularly cooperative since they did not want it in the first place and were not involved when the project was planned. The project provides a sort of "big brother" volunteer service for retardates and is increasingly moving into the provision of group recreational activities. Instances of case advocacy have occurred occasionally, by happenstance. It is not provided as a regular part of the program.

The third project is one in which the leadership in the initiation phase is consonant with leadership in the planning phase and where various groups in the community were involved in planning the project. However, the target community is rural and isolated with a rather disparate and fragmented population. Only one other community organization exists there and this one was not involved in planning the project. Major problems in the community are poverty, unemployment and a complete lack of public transportation.

Health services are also inadequate and inaccessible. The project is designed to implement a "systems model" approach to child advocacy whereby the community is supposed to identify its own needs, priorities and methods of solution. No other objectives were specified initially or have been subsequently. It is essentially a community-based planning and coordination program and has devoted almost all of its effort toward the establishment of a day care project within the community. Although it has been successful in this, it has at no time provided either case or class advocacy in its one and a half years of operation. It is physically situated within a local school system and sponsored by the local board of education, and functions almost as something of an extension of the school system. It does not see its role as one of internal advocacy, monitoring the school system in relation to children; it does not function in an external advocacy role, acting as spokesman for the student in relation to other services and/or institutions; it does not even utilize its position in the school system to train teachers to act as advocates for their students. Although the director and assistant director are actively involved with various organizations in the community, advocate line staff - indigenous paraprofessional - have been underutilized throughout the life of the project. This is a known and acknowledged problem by both staff and administration, however, nothing has been done about it.[1]

In reviewing these three additional "failures," other tentative indicia of difficulty now may be identified.

In the Planning Phase

- (Where a formal proposal is prepared and submitted to an outside funding source), preparation of such a proposal by a professional proposal writer who is not an integral part of the planning and initiation phase.

  (Re-examination now discloses that all of the projects in this study in which proposals were prepared in this manner are in the "failure" category.)

In the Initiation Phase

- New projects (as contrasted with components of existing programs) that are administered by the sponsoring organization with relatively little administrative autonomy in the hands of the project director.

- Projects based within a system, that itself impinges on children (e.g., school, juvenile justice) and that is unclear as to its role vis a vis the system (Is it an internal advocacy project or external in relation to other systems?)

---

[1] This project is one of the sixteen in the study that were case studies during the earlier research project as well. Thus, it was visited on two occasions with an eight month gap between visits, and the same problems continued to exist.

- Under or inappropriate utilization of staff.

ACTIVITIES CHARACTERISTIC OF EIGHT PROJECTS IDENTIFIED AS SUCCESSFUL

As a group, the eight tentative "successes" appear far more homogeneous than the same sized group of "failures" described earlier. To paraphrase Tolstoy, all successful projects are like one another; each unsuccessful project is unsuccessful in its own way. With regard to the planning phase, these projects (7) were begun as a result of individual initiatives (one by a combination of individual and funding agency initiatives); and only one project was stimulated solely by the initiative of a funding agency. Seven included widespread community participation in the planning phase; only one did not have substantial consumer involvement at that time. In addition, five were already able to be fairly specific about their objectives in this phase.

In seven of the projects, the planners continued to be actively involved in initiating and operationalizing the projects. The one project where this was not the case is the only one in this group that is a new component of an ongoing program rather than an entirely new project. In this case however, the top administrative staff were committed to the project from its inception through its initiation, thus providing continuity of leadership similar to the others.

None of these projects employed "crash programming" in the initiation phase. Four used "structured programming" and four, "developmental." Either directly or indirectly, all the projects stress the importance of staff understanding the projects' objectives and their own roles. Six placed particularly heavy emphasis on training either through extensive training programs, repeated annual training, or a combination of both. The two projects that provided less staff training are the most "professional" projects - employing either professional staff or college graduates with extensive and related work experience. Even for this group, one project director stated in looking back at the project's development, more stress should have been placed on staff training and he anticipates doing so in the second year of operation.

Again, all of these projects concentrated on obtaining widespread community support as the projects were initiated. Six have indigenous paid staff; three (including two of the former) have indigenous volunteer staff. Five of the six projects that have boards have community representatives (consumer, lay, influential, professional) as board members and active, regularly meeting advisory or policy-making boards. Of the two projects that do not have boards, one is attempting to form one and the other is part of another program. All projects have been involved in frequent meetings with consumers and lay people in the community as well as organizational representatives. Four are consciously struggling with the problem of consumer accountability and are not satisfied with current approaches for achieving this.

All eight are in the process of operationalizing their projects although only two are fully operational. All have continued to refine their goals and have commented on the need for greater goal specificity. As a group, these have the least dispersed targets. Three focus on the school system primarily; two on the juvenile justice system; one on a single institution. Only two focus on multiple targets. Five projects (all less than two years old) hope to implement class advocacy but are still unable to do so. For one, (a fully operational project) case and class advocacy are defined as equally important and receive equal attention in the project (although it appears to place greater stress on case advocacy). A second project, also fully operational, provides some class advocacy but deliberately stresses case advocacy. One project has decided that the two conflict and has opted for case advocacy. Two of the projects have existing replications already established; of these, one has eight such projects and the other is just establishing two. One other project attempted to do this but was unsuccessful.

Finally, four of the projects including the three oldest, stress the importance of organizing coalitions in the community to ensure a large constituency and broader support for specific issues. As a group, three projects are between two and two and a half years old; four are one and a half years old. One was fifteen months old at the time of the study, however, it was modeled after another project in this group that is one of the oldest in the sample.

ACTIVITIES CHARACTERISTIC OF FOUR PROJECTS IDENTIFIED AS "UNCERTAIN"

Finally, there are four remaining projects defined as "uncertain" which by our criteria appear to be in potential difficulty. A close look at this middle group may help identify other factors which may impede or enhance project implementation.

Three of these projects are the youngest in the study, all less than one year old; thus their categorization as "uncertain" may reflect their youth. All are components of existing programs and all were begun as a result of one funding agency singling these projects out to develop an advocacy component and awarding them a special grant to plan and then to establish the project. None of the people involved in planning these projects had heard of child advocacy prior to notification by the agency that they were selected to receive this grant. First, all project directors had to learn what child advocacy meant or might mean; second, they had to overcome the resistance of their boards and staff to developing a new program, when all felt more money was needed for the existing project. All the projects employed "crash programming" in the initiation phase. In one, the over-all director saw the need for having a lawyer on staff. Unable to pay a salary adequate to hire a lawyer, a third year law student completing school at night was hired as advocate coordinator. However, he defines the community's problems as, primarily, inadequate information about existing resources and a need for liaison, linkage, or brokerage between consumers and services. He sees no need for case advocacy and thus has not implemented it. He sees no class advocacy role for the project because he does not believe that the federal government should fund one organization to advocate against another. Thus, class advocacy has not been implemented. In general, no advocacy targets and therefore no advocacy strategies have been identified. The project is essentially an access service program, not an advocacy project as such.

The second project is similar to the above but did begin provision of case advocacy in the course of doing a survey of the community. Initially, conflict arose because case advocacy was provided only for "new families" not those already being served by the project. This problem decreased when administrative concern arose about the limited number of families interviewed over a six month period and the advocate coordinator decided to stop providing case advocacy and complete the survey identifying community needs (even though many of these needs were urgent and required immediate attention). At the time this project was visited, ten months after it began, it appeared to be going backwards rather than forwards.[1] The project has no specific objective, target or strategies and the program seems to lack structure and purpose.

The third project in this group appears more likely to move towards implementation. Planned and initiated in the same manner as the other two, this project has gone through several difficult problems but seems to have coped with them successfully. The project had several organizational problems during the first year which the director attributed to some of the limitations imposed by the funding agency and by the project's policy-making board. He accepted those limitations resulting from board actions but found the pressures for crash programming from the funding agency created more difficulty. There was inadequate time to hire staff, to train staff, to learn about existing resources, to specify targets and strategies, to develop a program generally. As a result, the initial community survey was inaccurately performed and much work had to be redone. In an effort at improving the program, a decision was made to eliminate part-time staff and staff supervision was reorganized. Regardless, conflict between the old project and the new component continued for some time.

---

[1] In the course of two additional visits and several other contacts during subsequent months, a colleague working on a related study reached the same conclusion.

Throughout all of this however, the project has concentrated on providing advocacy. Case advocacy is provided both to those families already served by the project and an additional group. It is provided on an ongoing basis while staff carry out their survey of the community. In effect, this survey is expected to provide the case finding for class advocacy by the staff. Regular monthly records are kept of all needs that are identified but cannot be adequately satisfied with existing resources or existing policies. At the same time the project was studied, the administrator was preparing to analyze the data on needs identified and documented during the six month period of the survey and select those which were identified most frequently. In conjunction with the board members of the over-all project, priorities for class advocacy and strategies for implementation would be identified.

The fourth project in this group has one of the largest budgets (over $200,000) and the largest staff (18) of the groups studied. It appears to encompass a range of recreational, tutoring and access services to achieve its objective of delinquency prevention and youth participation in the planning and programming of services related to them. It spun off its counseling services by obtaining an additional grant and setting it up as a separate program. Its first annual progress report specifies that the first year was focused on structuring the organization and establishing the project.

It has also had a large number of intra-organizational problems and in the course of one year, reduced its staff by ten, eliminating a group of "street workers" and reorganizing its program. It has also changed strategies from attempting to intervene in systems from the top in order to effect change, to intervention at the bottom where youths first come in contact with these systems. Where most of the program is concerned, the project is still feeling its way and it may be in difficulty. However it has been unusually successful in implementing class advocacy. This has been done by a young lawyer on the staff who has initiated several successful class action suits.

Among the suits involved are a right to treatment case against a local training school, and a due process case regarding the suspension from school of several high school students. (It may be worth noting here that of the projects that have been able to provide class advocacy, two have lawyers as active members of policy-making boards. This may have some implications for the implementation of class advocacy generally at the community level.)

In reviewing these four "uncertain" projects, two seem likely to join the "failure" group while the other two appear to have more potential for implementation. It would seem that the primary characteristic distinguishing the latter from the former is the regular and increasing provision of advocacy as time goes on, a greater specificity of advocacy targets, and, in general, a clear concept of and concentration on the "mission" of the project, regardless of the occurrence of other problems along the way.

Thus, utilizing assembled "case" data and preliminary judgments about project operations, the study has developed empirically a list of characteristics which may differentiate success and failure in advocacy programs at each stage of development. The study now proceeds to incorporate these elements into a first approximation of a phase-specific evaluation guide.(see appendix) and to report on its second phase.

CHAPTER VII

A FIRST ATTEMPT AT DIFFERENTIAL EVALUATION: THE FIELD TEST

FIELD TEST METHODOLOGY AND DESIGN

The last chapter described the process by which a tentative instrument for differential evaluation of community-based child advocacy projects was developed (see copy in the appendix). The three-part instrument - Classification of Child Advocacy Projects by Developmental Stages; Classification of Projects by Advocacy or Non-Advocacy; Rating of Projects at Current Stage of Development - is in the form of a semi-structured interview guide. It was designed to be used by field representatives on site visits to projects. In short, it was designed with a view to use in a typical monitoring situation.

This decision to identify with the task of the federal monitor may require some explanation. Our finding that project operationalization is a slow process, and that output evaluation is not feasible for several years, seems to preclude formal research - certainly in the first two years. Yet, given the stake in these undertakings, a mechanism to assure accountability is essential. The types of issues which we have found relevant to assessment during planning and initiation are obviously part of grant administration.

Since a major objective of this second phase was to provide data for refining the instrument through test of its applicability and reliability, it seemed more appropriate to have independent researchers make the field visits. The previous experience of this researcher with all the projects included in the sub-sample would have inevitably biased any test. On the other hand, testing the instrument on projects outside of the study sample would have precluded even a primitive, preliminary test of instrument reliability and validity. The decision, therefore, was to employ three independent researchers; provide a limited amount of training for them in the use of the instrument; have them use the instrument, and comment on its utility, facility of application, problems, and anything else of interest and relevance. Descriptive data to justify judgements and conclusions and/or illustrate problems, were to be appended separately, by these field visitors, to the instrument for use in reviewing findings and to supplement the instrument.

In brief, then, the objective of the field test was to learn the following:

1) Could the instrument be readily used by researchers previously unfamiliar with the concept and practice of child advocacy?

   If not, what changes would facilitate its use?

2) Would the project rating obtained from the instrument (data specified, conclusions of the field representative) be consistent with the conclusions drawn by this researcher during the first phase of the study (reliability check)?

If not, would it be possible to identify whether the discrepancies were a reflection of errors or gaps in the instrument, reality changes in the project over the six to eight month period of time since the last visit, an indication of inadequacy in selection or training of the field representatives, or something else?

3) What is the predictive capacity of the instrument? (e.g., if a project has been rated a failure in the planning or initiation phase as of the initial visit, has it progressed to a later phase or not? If it has, is it still rated the same way, even in the next phase?)

4) For projects in the implementation phase, could one begin to identify possible outcome measures? (As noted, impact measures were not relevant to the projects in earlier phases.)

As indicated in Chapter III, the second phase of this study was initially planned to include a field test of the instrument by this researcher, in a selected sub-sample of six child advocacy projects. It was also anticipated that the instrument would include criteria for outcome evaluation. As has been indicated, this proved unfeasible. This facet of the study findings will be discussed further in the concluding chapter.

Sample Size and Composition

The sub-sample of six projects was initially planned to include two projects rated "successful" and classified in the implementation phase as of December, 1972; two projects that had been rated "uncertain" and two rated "failure" or "unsuccessful," the latter four all in the initiation phase.

It was decided that since the sample was limited, none of the clearly "non-advocacy" projects would be included since little more could be learned from these to improve the instrument. Furthermore, in an effort at tapping more subtle distinctions between and among projects, neither the most obvious failures nor the most obvious successes would be included.

Although no project approached refused access, there was some difficulty in scheduling visits to fit in with the time limitations of this study and the availability of the field representatives, on the one hand, and the time constraints of the projects visited, on the other (e.g., scheduled visits of project monitors, other evaluation teams and/or researchers, potential funders; conference and speaking engagements of project staff). Thus, the final sample selected included two "successes," one "uncertain," and three "failures." These projects represent different geographic locations (West, South, and East); urban and rural projects; different funding sources (public and voluntary); different auspices (public, voluntary, autonomous, component part); different staffing patterns (paid, volunteer, professional, paraprofessional); different ethnic compositions of staff and target population (white, black, mixed); different types of advocacy (case, class, mixed); different targets (single and multiple); different entry points (case and service system); and different structures (formal, informal).

Data Collection

In each case, arrangements for access were made informally, over the telephone, and confirmed in writing subsequently.

Three doctoral students at Columbia University School of Social Work were employed for purposes of the field test. They received the equivalent of one full day of training and were given the final report of the previous study, Child Advocacy, and Chapter IV and V of this study to read for general background. In addition, limited factual material - proposals, publicity releases, information distributed by the project - was also provided for specific project background, as well as one copy of the instrument to review and raise questions about in advance. In short, an effort was made to approximate the monitoring situation in a federal agency.

A memorandum, with instructions for the site visits (a copy of which is also included in the appendix) also was provided. Each field representative was to visit two projects, for approximately two and one-half days each. Two completed both their visits in one week; the third, because of problems in scheduling the visits, had a one week hiatus between the two visits. All visiting was completed between May 4 and May 22, 1973. In each case, in addition to formal completion of the instrument for each project, a supplementary narrative summary was either dictated or written, and one-half day was devoted to subsequent "debriefing." These visits were defined to interviewees as designed to provide an opportunity to refine the instrument; to learn more about evaluation; and to learn more about child advocacy projects generally. All projects and staff were assured of complete confidentiality; all were informed that identifying information about the projects would be deleted.

In each field test, because of the constraints of time, it was agreed that the principal investigator or project director would arrange and schedule the interviews. It was understood that such selective screening might bias the results but was felt that "who" is interviewed should reflect the administration's most positive image of itself - a reasonable starting point. Some allowance should be made for this in the analysis, however.

Finally, although the field representatives knew that the projects visited included some rated successful, some rated unsuccessful and some rated uncertain, meticulous care was taken to avoid any trace of evaluative comments in the pre-field test period. In this regard, the visits were "blind."

What follows in the remainder of this chapter is a summary of the findings and conclusions of this first field test.

FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

Instrument Usability

The first purpose of the field test was to see whether the instrument developed could be used readily by researchers previously unfamiliar with the concept and practice of child advocacy. The assumption was that if there were problems with the instrument, these would be identified in the field test and corrected before attempting or suggesting more extensive use.

In general, the field investigators found that the interview guide was too unstructured for easy use. Because of their limited knowledge of child advocacy, extensive note taking during the interviews and extensive time for summary and analysis were required before the instrument itself could be filled in. Although some of the information gathered was helpful in providing supplementary information about child advocacy projects generally, application of this instrument on a larger scale would be facilitated by the development of a more structured questionnaire. Increased investment in training is an alternative but may not assure as high a degree of reliability over time as new personnel enter the process.

Initially, the selection of the particular format employed, was guided by the prevailing pattern in federal agencies. Project monitors use interview guides when reviewing federal projects, while researchers tend to use structured questionnaires for formal evaluation purposes. Considering the fact that only one of the field investigators was a researcher, and that all had extensive practice experience in social agencies of various types, their suggestion for further structuring of the instrument would seem to have merit.[1]

In addition to facilitating instrument use, employing a structured questionnaire limits interviewer bias. One problem that arose in the field test was the different perspective each interviewer brought to the interviews. For example, one field investigator was far more familiar with community organizing activities and practice than the others, while a second represented a traditional casework orientation towards social practice. The result was that the former had much higher (and clearer) expectations regarding advocacy activities, while the latter tended to equate all "good casework" with case advocacy. (Although "good casework" should include case advocacy when appropriate, the two are not synonymous. Counseling or providing escort services may be part of good casework practice, but are not advocacy. There is a valid distinction between the two.)

The different perspectives showed up more in their respective narrative summaries than in the instrument itself. However, there were some apparent variations in filling in the instrument, with regard to the types of activities described as "advocacy." A structured questionnaire would limit these variations as well as minimizing variations in interviewer styles, thus ensuring greater reliability of responses. Since the nature of the advocacy activities undertaken by the project and its staff is so crucial for both classification and evaluation purposes, accurate reporting becomes particularly important.

---

[1] In fact, based on this experience, a more structured instrument (with some open ended questions requiring probing by the interviewer) actually was developed in a parallel research effort when the staff of this project was asked by OCD to develop an instrument for the classification and rating of operational status of child advocacy projects generally in connection with HEW program strategies. This questionnaire, derived from the interview guide used here, illustrates what would be the next stage in instrument development for evaluating child advocacy projects. Several illustrative items are provided in the appendix.

Related to this, certain concepts and terms used in the instrument should be much more clearly and precisely defined within the instrument itself - in particular, case and class advocacy - to assure accurate and reliable responses by interviewees. Again, this is natural under a structured format and was incorporated into the instrument developed for the related project (see footnote on preceding page).

In the instrument used for the field test, projects were rated only at their current stage of development. Subsequently investigators were requested to rate the projects at at least one earlier stage, from the data they had included in their narrative summaries. Another suggested change found necessary is that although projects should be rated by their current stage of development, as of the field visit, the instrument should incorporate all stages, and final ratings for each project should be both phase-specific as well as cumulative. Following this procedure, projects classified as in the planning stage would be rated for planning only; projects at the initiation stage would be rated for planning and initiation; projects at the implementation stage would be rated for all three stages. In this way, evaluation of an implemented project would reveal its rating at each stage, permitting comparison with other projects at an earlier stage of development, as well as indicating whether its own pattern of development seemed consistent with its earlier development. This approach employed in a large number of projects might also help identify additional variables that might account for differences in subsequent stages.

Finally, in scheduling interviews for site visits, it now seems essential that the evaluator structure the order of interviews in advance, rather than permitting the project director to do so. For the purpose of the field test, project directors were permitted to schedule interviews at their convenience, as they saw fit. The results were unfortunate in several instances. For example, three directors scheduled initial interviews with clients, other agency representatives or board members, and arranged for administrators and staff to be interviewed only towards the end of the visit. For interviewers to obtain information in logical sequence, planners and administrators should be interviewed first so as to obtain a basic picture of the project. Staff should be interviewed next, for their perspective on their own roles, as well as to provide supplementary validating data about the project generally. Then board members, relevant experts or consultants should be seen. Consumers should be interviewed only after the interviewer has a firm grasp of what the project thinks it is doing, or trying to do. At the end of the process representatives of target agencies should be interviewed to round out the picture and to provide data from an outside point of view. Some time at the end of the visit should be allotted to re-interviewing planners and directors for follow-up, filling in gaps, or resolving possible confusion and differences. This ordering of interviews ensures that the interviewers will obtain a picture of what the overall project looks like, and what it is doing before they obtain more specialized data that support - or conflict with - the general description and lead to evaluative judgements.

Instrument Reliability and Project Changes Over Time

The second purpose of the field test was to provide a reliability check on project classifications and ratings completed by this researcher in the first phase of the study. The instrument employed in the test was derived from data obtained in field visits made between October and mid-December, 1972, while the instrument itself was developed during the following three months and applied retrospectively to the projects. The field test itself occurred approximately six months after these initial visits, in May, 1973. A more valid test of reliability would have been made if the independent investigators had gone into the field at the same time as this researcher, however the process by which the instrument was developed made such an approach impossible. Recognizing the potential problems resulting from such a gap between the time when the original data were obtained and when the field test was made, it still seemed worthwhile and appropriate to try to compare the findings of the field test with the initial findings and ratings of the six projects involved, to see if there was consistency. Where inconsistencies appeared, some consideration would be given to discovering whether they might be attributable to the hiatus between the two visits, or whether they reflected errors or inadequacies in the instrument itself.

As mentioned earlier, the projects selected for the test included two labelled "successful,", one "uncertain," and three "failures." In addition, the first two of these were in the implementation phase and the remaining four in the initiation phase. With regard to the classification of projects into developmental phases, four were classified in the same stage by both the field test and this researcher (the two successful projects and two of the failures). One of the failure group, and the one labeled uncertain were reclassified as just beginning the implementation phase (advocacy activities now being provided regularly). In both of these projects, the passage of time appears to have made a substantial difference and to explain the discrepancy. For the former, one of the youngest projects - less than one year old at the time studied - one would expect a six month passage of time to reveal changes, since developmental stages are in part, time-related. For the second project, however, although the passage of time may have made a difference, what seems more important, is that a major change in programming occurred, leading to its reclassification into the implementation phase. This second project was planned and initiated as a case advocacy project; this facet of the program has still not been implemented. However, during the initiation period, project goals and strategies were redefined and the program redesigned to emphasize class advocacy. It now appears to be implementing its first class advocacy activities and is no longer attempting provision of case advocacy. How the instrument could be redesigned to tap such potential for change, and whether or not this changed program can be sustained and be effective, requires further study.

With regard to project rating, once again the findings are mixed. In general, failures seem to be more reliably evaluated as failure, on an item by item basis, than successes. Ratings for all three unsuccessful projects were the same on every item both initially and for the field test, for the initiation phase. However, one project in this group was reclassified and thus also rated in the implementation phase. One problem in evaluating projects is highlighted here because the project (described above) changed from a case to a class advocacy focus, and redefined its goals in the process. If project rating and evaluation generally are concerned with the extent to which a project achieves its initially specified goals, this project would still be rated as a failure. On the other hand, if evaluation addresses implementation of "advocacy" and accepts changed goals that are effectively achieved, this project would currently be rated "uncertain." Perhaps the most interesting question here is why the program changed and whether this potential for change could have been identified earlier. According to the principal investigator and the project director, after one and one-half years in operation they realized that the project goals (case advocacy in a local elementary school, provided by specialized, indigenous paraprofessional aides; class advocacy, to evolve from documentation of case findings) could not be achieved by the existing project structure (aides working within the classrooms as liaison between parents and school). The school was too powerful and intransigent; the aides had too little training, knowledge and expertise: the school administration and staff were unresponsive; the project and its leadership did not have enough political clout.) The project directors decided instead to use the aides to organize groups of parents around specific issues (introducing ethnic material into the school curricula; getting the teacher of a particular class changed; adding a specific extra-curricula program) and to train the parents to act as advocates for themselves and their children. Their feeling was that organized parent groups, working in their own self-interest, might be more effective in the school than outside project staff.[1] At present, after six months of work, these groups have been organized, have selected specific, limited issues to address, and have begun to effect certain changes. The problem that remains is that the aides still feel they have insufficient skills to organize and train the parents and the project has been unable to obtain the support of the existing Parent-Teachers Association and thus expand its own power base. Of some interest in this recent development is that unlike the original program, it was planned and initiated by the project director working with staff and a local community group (the project director was not involved in planning for the initial program). Whether or not it can succeed remains to be seen, however, this project has made a definite change since the earlier visit, and the potential for change was not revealed in the earlier rating.

The project classified initially as "initiation phase," rating "uncertain," is now classified as beginning implementation, "uncertain." Its rating for the initiation phase is the same in both the field test and the phasing-in study. However, it has recently expanded its training program for staff (now given four times a year for one week each time) and is providing case advocacy regularly. (My concern with this project is that one of the consumers interviewed by the field representative was the same as one interviewed earlier by this researcher, and the other had been extensively described to me at that time. After a seven month hiatus,one would expect different clients to be presented. Perhaps this tendency to display "trained clients" should be incorporated as a criterion!)

---

[1] The United Bronx Parents Organization began in New York City on a similar basis, although the idea was generated by the parents themselves. It has been increasingly successful since its inception, seven years ago.

It is with regard to the successful projects that the greatest discrepancies appeared between the initial ratings and the field visit evaluations. One project that had been implementing both case and class advocacy had not been involved in any class advocacy for the past four months when revisited. Its recently recruited volunteer staff had received no training for their advocacy roles. It is rated on the guide as never having been replicated elsewhere. (The interviewer was told this by the project director although seven other community-based projects consider themselves to have been designed on the model of this project!) Finally, consumer and board input into the project is now identified as negligible, although it had earlier been rated as high.

Are these discrepancies an indication of the unreliability of the instrument or has the project actually changed? If the latter, what caused the change? In exploring these discrepancies between the initial rating and the current one, it was discovered that the project director had resigned five months earlier, and the assistant director three months before the field visit. Although the current director had been a staff member from the project's inception, he had only come to the community at that time, in contrast to the two administrators who had been born and brought up in the community. The new director was totally unfamiliar with the project's origins and over-all administration, unclear about the project's current funding, could not locate a copy of the original project description or a copy of a proposal recently approved for federal funding. No board meeting had been held for four months and no staff training. Interviews with target agency representatives revealed a sharp decrease in contacts and the community groups previously working with the project are no longer in contact with it. From this limited data, it would appear that the change in the project leadership was followed by a rapid decline of the project. Furthermore, elections held in November, 1972 resulted in substantial changes on the local school board and other local offices. A conservative political group is now dominant in the community and the current director is fearful of antagonizing local government officials. He has instructed staff to eliminate class advocacy activities. The project is now concentrating on direct services and limited case advocacy. Needless to say the project is rated currently as "unsuccessful," in the implementation phase, with an explicit comment by the field investigator that, "This project appears to have gone downhill sharply within the last few months, according to both staff, cooperating and target agency representatives."

The sixth project, and the second rated "successful" initially, is classified as implemented, but rated also as far less successful than previously. Again, its ratings for the initiation phase are the same as earlier while its ratings for the implementation phase have changed sharply. For example, as part of the validating data supporting the item stating that case advocacy is provided regularly (one case advocacy action per week per full-time staff member) this project documented 238 cases - with multiple advocacy activities - for the period of January 1, 1972 - December 31, 1972 and only 28 cases between January 1, and May, 1973. In explaining this decline in case advocacy, the principal investigator informed the interviewer that he had been notified that because of cutbacks in federal funding for social programs, federal funding would end in the coming year (the project's third year of operation), even though the project was considered to have been effective. He had managed to obtain assurance from a state mental health agency that funds could be obtained to continue the project if its focus were shifted to an emphasis on "mental health." The project's goals and strategies are currently being redefined to meet new guidelines and the project is now emphasizing counseling and direct services.

Earlier Ratings' Predictive Validity

Implicit in what has been said in the previous section, early ratings of failure appear to be predictive of failure in later stages while successful ratings in an early phase have only partial validity in predicting success. Those projects which moved from the initiation phase to the implementation phase and had been rated as unsuccessful, in the earlier phase, continue to be rated as either unsuccessful or, at best, uncertain, in the later phase. The two projects that were rated as successful in the initiation phase, by both the field investigators and this researcher, and had been initially rated successful in the implementation phase, were subsequently rated uncertain or failure in the field test. Although the issue may be one of instrument reliability, the findings seem to indicate that the changed rating is attributable to variations in the project that occurred during the six months between the two visits, for reasons mentioned earlier.

Thus the predictive capacity of early ratings appears analogous to the situation regarding the reliability of the instrument: Are the ratings valid only for predicting failure? Is the instrument reliable only where unsuccessful projects are concerned? Or is the instrument itself both unreliable generally and invalid for predicting anything about a project? Perhaps the only reason consistent conclusions are reached about project failure is that the probability of failure is so great that any casual assumption of failure has a high probability of accuracy, regardless of the basis for the conclusion. One other possible reason for this difficulty in identifying, or predicting successful advocacy projects is that advocacy projects by their very nature may be so ephemeral that the likelihood of a successful project remaining successful is very slim. Finally, as is pointed out by two well-known theorists of organizational change - and confirmed by the findings in this study - failure in the early stages of project development may well preclude success in later stages; however, success in the early stages does not ensure success in a later stage.[1] The problem may well be that the phenomenon is too young, and we still have not identified enough successful projects to provide precise data regarding what variables are critical in determining success. Unsuccessful projects are legion and we can, and should learn from them.

For whatever reasons, the instrument does not seem able to identify or predict sustained success in child advocacy projects,although it does seem able to identify and predict failure and potential failure. Why this is the case can only be answered by further study. To some extent, the capacity to screen out obvious failures early in life may permit easier identification of potential - or transitory - successes. More intensive study of this category may eventually clarify what a successful project really is, whether its success can be sustained for any period of time and what variables might account for such success.

---

[1] Hage and Aiken, op. cit., pp. 31-32.

Additional Emergent Variables

In analyzing the data obtained from the field test - in particular, the narrative summaries provided by the field investigators - certain additional variables emerged, whose presence would seem to be positively correlated with success and whose absence seems positively correlated with failure. The first variable so identified, is the importance of staff supervision. Among the most important indicia of difficulty in project development is failure to provide adequate training for advocacy staff. Further study of this sub-sample of six projects, seems to indicate that not only is training of enormous importance, but competent, ongoing and regular supervision is an additional essential. From discussion with staff of several projects, it would appear that the content of training programs may be lost unless staff have opportunity to apply their new learning in practice as well as to clarify problems and verify substance with a competent supervisor. In general, group supervision seems preferred by most paraprofessionals, as being least threatening and most helpful in terms of providing an opportunity to share in the experience of peers as well as to obtain additional expertise and skills from someone more experienced. Where training programs exist without adequate subsequent supervision, staff tend to view the training as "schooling" and the subsequent practice as "work," and find it difficult to integrate the two.

Second, efforts at self evaluation were identified earlier as being characteristic of the implementation phase of project development. In reviewing and analyzing evaluation reports of projects, prepared either by internal or external staff, a further criterion - or qualifying variable - appears to be an essential facet of successful implementation. Almost all the evaluation reports prepared by projects included in the over-all study (three in the sub-sample; four in the larger sample) utilize measures of effectiveness such as increased reading scores and higher school grades when evaluating the achievements of projects. Thus far, only one project has tried to employ measures specifically related to advocacy. It would seem therefore, that in seeking out successfully implemented child advocacy projects we might look for projects which incorporate such advocacy-specific measures into their own efforts at assessing project accomplishments. Certainly, it seems reasonable to expect a project stressing advocacy to evaluate its achievement in that context, and not in other, less relevant terms.

Finally, in our search for successfully implemented projects, one other criterion seems a likely candidate for indicating success, although thus far no project reveals it. In a sense, this characteristic (or variable) might indicate the presence of a fourth phase of project development, one which was initially hypothesized but then eliminated because no project in the current study revealed its presence. This variable might be defined as "stability;" as a separate phase it might be termed "continuity" as was mentioned in Chapter V, or "routinization" as defined by Hage and Aiken. This phase is described in the literature as characterized by the stabilization of a project or program; its presence is demonstrated when the initial project leadership leaves and the project continues with its mission under new and different leadership. Close study of child advocacy projects has revealed how crucial the factor of project leadership is. We have seen repeatedly, how apparently successful projects decline when directors leave. Perhaps an important indicator of a successful and fully implemented project is its capacity for continuity even when its leadership changes. However, as mentioned earlier, this may be only a theoretical possibility. In real life, loss of leadership may inevitably mean loss of direction for social programs. Routinization may be true only for other types of organizations, or only in theory, and stability may continue to elude child advocacy projects. Clearly, this has been the case for projects in this sample. Unfortunately, it seems equally obvious that without some stability successful projects cannot maintain their success. An intermediate approach might be, therefore, to include as a criterion for successful implementation the continuation of project mission for at least six months under new leadership.

Although this is not an emergent variable, one other problem emerged which the instrument was not able to handle, and that is the absence of any criterion that can incorporate or make allowance for a complete change in the nature of a program such as the project that changed from a case to a class advocacy focus. Is there some kind of instrument that will permit evaluation when project goals change completely? Or is it possible merely to indicate that a project failed to achieve initially defined goals, but then was reorganized, and redefined its goals? What is the likelihood of such change being effectively implemented? Is it worthwhile supporting a project that seems to be developing unsuccessfully for two years, and then continue to support it in another guise? Perhaps here, what is needed is a cut-off point. For example, if a project does not implement its initial program by the end of the second year, and wants to change its focus, the whole plan for change should be subject to re-evaluation almost as if it were proposed anew. The problem of goal change and reorganization of a project suggests another area for further study.

While this chapter has reported on the findings of the field test of the instrument, the narrative summaries completed by the field investigators provide further insights into child advocacy projects, programs and practice, generally supplementing, refining, or confirming impressions obtained by this researcher in the first phase of the study. Some discussion of this material will be included in the next chapter.

CHAPTER VIII

ADVOCACY REVISITED

This study has been focused essentially on methodological issues and questions regarding the evaluation of child advocacy projects. In this chapter, I have tried to employ the findings and observations of the current study to evaluate the method employed - mail survey and semi-structured case studies - in the earlier baseline study and to derive some new and additional insights into the nature of child advocacy. What follows, therefore, is quite consciously outside of the original and basic design of the study; however, the material included evolved inevitably out of the unique opportunity provided for revisiting a large group of child advocacy projects (sixteen of the twenty-three had been visited one or more times previously), and for reviewing, refining and revising some of the ideas about the programs and practice expressed in the earlier, 1971-72 survey.

CRITIQUE OF THE METHOD EMPLOYED IN THE BASELINE STUDY

The most obvious fault of the 1971-72 study was the reliance on a mail survey of programs and practice. Data so assembled, have limited reliability and validity. This limitation became apparent when the first case studies were completed in late 1971 and was further confirmed by the experiences of the current study. For example, the three projects inappropriately labeled child advocacy initially responded to the questionnaire by stating that they were indeed "child advocacy projects."[1] Yet, when visited this year, they immediately acknowledged the inappropriateness of the label. In almost every case, a mail questionnaire elicited idealized responses combining intent and anticipation, and representing a kind of "wishful thinking." The 1972-73 study confirmed the existence of an enormous gap between rhetoric (the questionnaire responses) and practice (what really went on in the projects). Some of these responses were deliberately inappropriate, in part because project directors defined the study as influencing the continuation of their funding. In other cases, the errors in response were the result of honest ignorance and confusion. Inevitably, a questionnaire developed to elicit responses in an unknown domain reflected some of our own initial lack of conceptual clarity and thus contributed to some of the problems of respondents. This may have been unavoidable since one function of the questionnaire was to help clarify the concept and to delineate parameters.

Mail questionnaires require a particularly high degree of precision in language and a clear definition of terms and concepts. This becomes particularly difficult in a diffuse domain. To illustrate some of the confusion of respondents, one question asked was whether an organization was supported by public or voluntary funds. If their auspice or sponsorship was voluntary, even though the project was totally supported by public funding, project directors sometimes indicated that they were "voluntary organizations" and financed through voluntary funding. Confusion was rampant also in the responses to how "professional" and "paraprofessional" staff were distinguished and what was meant by "accountability" or responsiveness to consumers. Direct interviews have the enormous advantage of permitting probing and exploration when it is apparent that the interviewee has misunderstood the question or there is some unanticipated language imprecision.

---

[1] See Chapter VI for some discussion of these projects.

Even though the mail questionnaire had been pretested, many of these "bugs" were still not eliminated. Confusion about the use of terms and language in a questionnaire is even more likely to occur where professional, regional or cultural differences exist in the group surveyed. Thus, a national survey cutting across interdisciplinary practice was subject to even more difficulty as a result. Recognizing that the problem of interviewer bias is more likely to occur in direct interviews, it still seems a preferable risk for purposes of describing and analyzing actual programs and practice. As indicated in the last chapter, a structured questionnaire may limit some potential bias.

Finally, another limitation inherent in the method of the earlier study relates to our earlier ignorance about the life history of child advocacy projects. We were not aware of the stages and phases in project development and assumed these projects would be much further along operationally than they were in fact. Searching for what could be defined as child advocacy practice, we tended to identify with new project directors and assumed that what was planned would eventually be implemented. In retrospect, we now know that in surveying newly established projects, it is particularly important to make several visits even if they are brief, with a gap of six or more months between them. Older organizations, especially if they are small-scale, can be studied more extensively in one visit because their operations are readily visible and their routines more fixed. New ones require at least two visits over a period of time to see if there is any actual implementation of what was initially projected. Personal observation of staff and program in action is undoubtedly the best way to know what is really going on in a project.

NEW INSIGHTS INTO CHILD ADVOCACY

The Role of the Funding Agency: Conflicting Guidelines and Directives

As mentioned earlier in Chapter VI, the availability of funding is the single most important factor in stimulating the development of new projects and influencing their over-all "look." This finding confirms our earlier impression (see monograph) that "money" appeared to be the most important factor in determining goals, bases of operation and even organizational structure. Since seventeen of these projects are funded by federal sources, federal agency guidelines assume enormous importance. The inherent conflicts, both explicit and implicit, in some of these guidelines, and the problems, difficulties and resentments that emerged in child advocacy projects as a result became readily apparent as these projects received closer scrutiny. For example, without any clear idea of what child advocacy meant conceptually or in practice, several federal agencies announced their intention to fund community-based child advocacy projects. Indicating their interest in funding demonstration projects reflecting a variety of models of child advocacy, several proposals (even among the groups funded subsequently) were turned down because their design did not reflect the type model the agency was interested in. Furthermore, having decided to fund child advocacy projects and not being sure what was meant by this, federal agencies also insisted they wanted a high degree of community involvement or participation (without defining what was meant by that) from communities that knew even less about child advocacy. For the most part, the concept of "community involvement" or "community participation" was defined in very narrow terms. That is, as establishing a policy-making board composed of consumers or program beneficiaries. One result was that a group of six projects funded by BEH/NIMH found themselves under constant pressure to establish elected, active, policy-making boards with such membership.[1] As will be discussed in greater detail later, the two projects that tried to do this exactly were overwhelmingly unsuccessful in their efforts; the remaining four were constantly faulted for their delay in acting on this and for their inadequacy in achieving it. Yet, the fact is that none of these projects arose in response to community pressures or initiatives; and only one was able to generate strong, spontaneous consumer support for the project during the planning and initiation phase. Furthermore, a review of the experiences of any other community program begun under similar conditions (e.g., the Parent Child Centers) revealed that establishment of such a board takes almost two years of concentrated work by project directors, staff and community residents to begin functioning; and another year or two to function really independently and effectively.

Pressure for establishment for this type of board within the initiation phase (and generally within the first year) created unnecessary problems for several projects and is indicative of the unrealistic expectations of funding agencies and evaluators who view project accomplishments within the framework of such guidelines. In general, explicit guidelines from BEH/NIMH projects were rather vague and general. However, during the course of the first year it became apparent that many more implicit guidelines did exist, often in memoranda circulated among agency staff but not revealed to project directors. Thus, situations were created in which projects were supposed to meet implicit but unfamiliar and unknown criteria.

---

[1] These projects were funded jointly by the Bureau of the Educationally Handicapped (BEH) and the National Institute of Mental Health (NIMH).

A second area of conflict arose in relation to the three Parent Child Center-Advocacy Projects. The Office of Child Development awarded $100,000 for each of seven Parent Child Centers to develop new advocacy components in addition to their ongoing programs. The guidelines for this new component stressed the importance of the Parent Child Center's target community's identification of the needs of children (0-5) and their families and an indication of what the community's priorities were with regard to these needs. However, the national Parent Child Center guidelines all stressed pre-natal and neo-natal maternal and child health care. All the initial meetings with project monitors and federal administrators from OCD, also emphasized the provision of maternal and child health care as the essential unmet need. There is a built-in contradiction in guidelines stressing the need for community identification of needs and priorities at the same time as agencies are told specifically, by the funding agency, what those needs and priorities are to be. In three of the projects studied, conflict over this definition of need emerged at the onset. First the question was raised, if the community was to identify its own needs and priorities, might it reject the idea of child advocacy altogether and opt for increasing direct service provision or for some other alternative? Second, once the project and the community accepted the fact that the special grant was for child advocacy only, the question raised was "why send people out to interview families in the community about their needs, if they have already been defined for us as maternal and child health care?" Finally, when initial surveys of the community were completed, in all three projects, the number of pregnant women were much fewer than had been anticipated; and the number of teenage mothers was fewer. In two of the three projects, the number of children aged 0-5 was substantially less than projected. These projects then found themselves in a situation in which a variety of needs had emerged in the community which were not necessarily related to needs specified in the guidelines or in the instructions from Washington. Concern was expressed by several directors as to whether the project could respond to other needs; whether they would be evaluated with regard to achievements in providing maternal and child health care; if they could only focus on the latter and it was a relatively unimportant need in their community, what should staff do? It would seem that if there is a situation in which the federal government is convinced of the need for a particular service and wants to ensure its provision (and there are obvious illustrations of this) why go through the fiction of requesting community identification of needs since the potential for non-agreement is sc great and the result so likely to be conflict and community resentment?

The issue of community identification of needs and priorities leads to a second area of conflict resulting from funding agency directives. That is the frequent confusion around the instrument employed for exploring community needs - a door-to-door or telephone survey of families by project staff. Five of the projects developed questionnaires for surveying the community around needs and priorities. Two other projects refused to follow the funding agency's directive regarding this because of community resistance. Numerous surveys had already been completed within recent years and community residents refused to comply with another survey, suggesting that such data were already available. In two other cases federal agencies had supported such research but the reports were unavailable to project directors. For the five projects that tried to implement this survey, three designed a questionnaire and sent staff out into the community. The remaining two, funded by another HEW agency, were told that their questionnaires must be approved by the Office of Management and Budget before being used. One project submitted its questionnaire in May, 1972 to its project monitor and still had not received approval in

November of that year; the second submitted it in July and had **not** received any response by November. For both projects, staff time had been allotted to the survey and the result of the prolonged and unanticipated delay was a substantial under-utilization of staff. In addition, program development, geared to the result of the planned survey, could not proceed. There appears to be some contradiction in the fact that two agencies in one federal department follow such totally different approaches with regard to the development and use of a questionnaire for a community survey. It is understandable that community residents might be sensitive about being interviewed and there might be a valid issue regarding invasion of privacy. However, if this is the case, it would appear that the decision should be made by the community, not the federal government. And if the federal government is making it, at least it should be made consistently. Finally, if approval is to be granted by another federal agency, surely it should not take more than seven months, especially when one considers the limited life span of most of these projects.

Two other problems related to federal funding arise out of the confusion around what a research and demonstration project is and the consequences of short-term funding for new and innovative service delivery projects. Fourteen of the seventeen federally funded projects are located in poverty areas. Principal investigators and directors of several of these projects (needless to say, they requested anonymity) indicated that their projects were really not "research and demonstration" projects but were rather structures for channeling money into the community by providing jobs for community residents (an approach similar to that of many of the anti-poverty projects). Within this context, one black director of a project situated in a ghetto community pointed out that:

> The time for this approach is past. Providing jobs for a few people is no longer defined as adequate criteria for establishing a new project. If the feds are going to put money into research and demonstration projects, let them find good models of high quality service delivery. New projects that are unclear about what they are trying to accomplish or are similar to other previously unsuccessful projects in the community should not be funded. Instead, concentrate if necessary on a few really imaginative approaches of proven existing models and provide enough money for a sufficient period of time to accomplish something.

Not only is there serious interest around the country in real program innovation and valid research and demonstration projects, but related concern is expressed regarding the nature of federal funding, in particular the "short-term" approach such funding tends to follow, and the consequences of this for innovative efforts at service delivery. As is obvious from the findings of this study, the start-up period for new projects is much longer than is generally recognized (between one and two years). Considering this, funding projects for one year is meaningless and even three year funding ends for many projects when they have just become fully operational. Realistically, the investment in setting up new projects cannot begin to pay off until sometime in the third year, shortly before the demise of many of these. Although several projects are trying to generate local financial support, the problems in obtaining this can be seen if one looks at a voluntary network of community-based projects which also used a three year time frame as the basis for assured funding and assumed that individual projects could be self-supported locally, subsequently. Except for one project, this has **not** worked and the central organization has acknowledged the problem but has not yet been successful in solving it.

The major consequence of this type of funding is that just as a project is ready for an impact evaluation study, its funding ends, often before an accurate evaluation of outcome can be made and regardless of whether or not the project is a success or a failure.

The Target Community

A belated recognition of the importance of the target community as a factor in influencing the development of a child advocacy project emerged in the course of this study. In particular, it is a factor that should be more carefully considered when planning a new project. The degree of community cohesion (as contrasted with community fragmentation) directly influences the time and effort required to obtain community participation in planning and the success in establishing a new project. As mentioned earlier, the previous experience communities have had with federal projects also influences their attitudes toward newly established child advocacy projects. For example, six communities that had been flooded by new and short-term projects in the sixties were highly suspicious of child advocacy projects. Four of these (and an additional two) were in communities that had been heavily surveyed and studied by neighboring universities and teaching hospitals and rejected any project that was premised on instituting a "community survey." Not only did a compromise have to be worked out, but one community that was particularly "gun-shy" about research almost rejected the project in toto until it was given the right to limit activities of outside evaluators.

Under these circumstances, developing a constituency in the community for a project requires deliberate effort, time, and often, imagination. Related to this, directors of the thirteen projects located in underserviced communities are completely satisfied with their choice of target communities, while the directors of the five projects located in "heavily serviced" communities now question the appropriateness of their choice. The latter feel that the role of the project is limited to providing access services and case advocacy. Class advocacy is defined as far more difficult to implement in such communities and their conclusion is that projects in such communities have much less visible impact than projects located in a community where anything accomplished is highlighted.

In a sense, the problem appears to be perceived incorrectly by these directors. It would seem that the issue is not necessarily selection of an underserviced community versus a heavily serviced one, but rather the need for an appropriate diagnosis of the problem or need in a community which would then lead to the selection of appropriate objectives, targets and strategies. Instead, these directors are saying, in effect, given a particular objective, we should have chosen a community that would have facilitated its achievement. This may be valid for projects claiming that the funding agency defined the objectives, but not for those free to define them as they saw the need. Regardless of which perspective is employed, it is essential for the planner of new projects to understand the role the community may play in enhancing or impeding project development.[1]

Advocacy Goals, Objectives and Targets

The creation of child advocacy projects is as much a reaction against how other agencies, organizations, and

---

[1] For some related comments about the community and advocacy targets and strategies, see Kramer, *op. cit.*, pp. 260-273. One difference between community action programs and child advocacy programs may be that the latter do not appear to reflect conflict between the "competent community" and the "competent program." On the contrary, it seems that the more competent the community, the more competent the program, thus implying that community competence must come first.

institutions are serving children as it is a response to re-ordering children's needs in our system of national priorities. In selecting objectives and targets for intervention, projects that are based at the community level must recognize the importance of selecting those in which intervention is possible from their community base. If more powerful targets are selected, projects must develop appropriate strategies, for example, limit the number of targets addressed; focus on a circumscribed segment of a major target; or expand the power base of the project. As further illustration, almost every project in the study includes an individual school or local school system as one or more of the targets addressed. Projects which appear most successful either provide case advocacy to a limited number of children or classes within one or two schools; select the school system as the only target addressed by the project (thus permitting the development of uniform procedures for handling advocacy cases and developing staff expertise regarding this target system); or organize coalitions with several other community, county, or even state organizations around specific issues such as changing a state law or bringing a class action law suit.

A realistic approach to the selection of objectives and targets would include some recognition of what the community defines as important, some selection of what can realistically be achieved, as well as decisions about strategies for achieving it. The head of one project commented:

> Community-based projects can effect only very limited change at limited local levels; thus their objectives should be circumscribed and realistic. Programs which have as their objectives rhetorical goals about major institutional change are unrealistic and should not be funded. At best, community-based projects can attempt to create a community conscience which may then begin to generate some activities for more important change.

Another problem in relation to goals and objectives lies in the confusion between objectives and strategies.[1] Many projects find it difficult to separate the two and thus find goal achievement impossible to attain. For example, one community-based project which provides direct services as a strategy for obtaining credibility in the community or mobilizing a constituency to support the project recognizes that such provision is strictly functional, and may gradually eliminate it. In contrast to this, another project that provides direct services because other agencies make referrals to it and community people expect service, in time may permit the direct service program to become the total project component and may lose sight of its original objectives. A related issue is whether or not advocacy can be practiced in communities with substantial quantitative inadequacies in services. Additional study may prove that effective implementation of advocacy may require the existence of certain basic service minima in a community.

---

[1] For example, the Progress Report of one project states: "The YDPPA strategy is to divert children from the juvenile justice system, avoid negative labeling of children, reduce alienation among youth, and develop greater access on the part of youth to socially desirable roles. The program achieves these objectives by providing direct services and by bringing about institutional change." (Emphasis added)

One final problem regarding specificity of objectives is the potential conflict between the need to specify objectives as early as possible in planning a project and the simultaneous need to maintain flexibility and openness in a project, not delineating criteria for evaluation so early that the project is frozen into rigidity at its inception. It would seem that the process of achieving goal specificity has to be defined as a matter of degree, increasingly delineated over time. Certainly this seems to be the case in the most successful projects in this study. Thus, an initial objective of one project was to ensure that the school system be made more responsive to the needs of students. During the initiation phase, goals were further specified to include the development of a formal grievance procedure to handle individual student complaints; changing school policies (permitting pregnant girls to remain in school; permitting lay advocates to accompany students at disciplinary hearings; using school buildings on weekends); ensuring provision of students' legal rights; changing legislative codes. Almost all the directors of projects studied (in particular, all the "successful," "uncertain" and even one of the "failure" group) recognize themselves that their goals tend to be too broad and too diffuse. The most successful projects are the ones that seem to be most aware of this problem and are constantly striving to narrow their focus and establish priorities. Delineating priorities unfortunately presents problems for many organizations both new and well established, so learning how to do this may merely be an inevitable part of a project's "growing pains."

Advocacy Processes

Almost half the projects (10) were established on the assumption that they would provide both case and class advocacy with case advocacy providing the case findings that in time would identify class advocacy issues and document positions. Since four of these stated that class advocacy would not be implemented until the third year of the project and none of these was in its third year at the time studied, it may be unfair to note that none of the four and only one of the remaining group of six established on this premise has managed to implement class advocacy. On the other hand, two projects that successfully provided class advocacy did so soon after beginning provision of case advocacy. However, this action was not premised on individual case advocacy findings; Instead, in these projects class advocacy is defined as having a different substantive base and is handled by separate specialist staff, including lawyers.

One of the most interesting findings of the 1971-72 national survey of child advocacy was the high incidence of projects providing both case and class advocacy. Since previous experience and all evidence reported in the literature indicated the inevitability of conflict when both types were provided by one organization, the apparent shared existence of case and class advocacy in child advocacy projects was quite noteworthy.[1]

All twenty-three of these projects were in last year's study and all claimed to be providing both types of advocacy at that time. Only four were in fact doing so at the time of this study. One obvious conclusion is the one mentioned earlier - the fallibility of mail surveys. Another, of course, is the difficulty in knowing what in fact is being provided in the project when a new facet of the program has just been initiated. That these projects anticipated provision of class advocacy as well as case advocacy is unquestioned; that there is a large gap between the anticipation, the plan, and the implementation seems quite obvious now.

Thus, one reason that child advocacy projects appear able to encompass both case and class advocacy is that they are only providing the former and still planning provision of the latter at some future point (once the project has received substantial community support or the need for class advocacy is well documented empirically). It is still possible that this dual thrust is feasible. However, there is no evidence in current child advocacy practice to support this conclusion. In fact, one "successful" project has supported the conventional position that the two conflict and that class advocacy at the community level is not feasible because it requires the active support of individuals whose only real concern is their own case and who do **not** want attention drawn to their problems.

---

[1] For extensive discussion of the potential conflict between case and class advocacy, see references to articles by Edward J. O'Donnell listed in the bibliography. In support of this conventional position, see also, Charles Grosser, Helping Youth; Kahn, Studies in Social Policy and Planning (New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1969), Chapter VII. In contrast to his earlier position, O'Donnell recently stated that current research on multi-service centers seems to indicate that case and class advocacy can be provided by the same organization. (Personal Communication, June, 1972)

With regard to the four projects that do provide both case and class advocacy, two explanations are possible. First, in three of the projects, separate staff provide each type of advocacy; lawyers in particular, are utilized for the provision of class advocacy either through class action suits or through identification of targets, appropriate strategies and the training of lay staff. Second, is the possibility that it is not class advocacy (or social action) per se that conflicts with case advocacy (or direct services) but rather the nature of the strategies employed in achieving the relevant objectives. For example, characteristic of all these projects are the consensual, non-conflictual strategies employed in achieving these objectives. Fact finding, persuasion, negotiation, publicity, the use of influentials, community organization and community pressure, the development of coalitions and broad-based constituencies, and lobbying are standard techniques; adversarial positions and direct confrontation tactics are played down. Although the threat of court action was important in getting initial recognition, the director of one eminently successful case and class advocacy project said that after two years of operation, direct confrontation techniques were used increasingly less and were defined by staff as less necessary as their knowledge and expertise grew. Documentation of positions taken - buttressing these positions by facts and knowledge of relevant laws and statutes - is identified as the most effective strategy for successful advocacy at both the case and class level. "Argue from and with the facts. Forget the rhetoric, the emotional positions, the irrational fighting." This is the approach described as particularly effective in changing policies and procedures in formal bureaucracies or in changing the attitudes of hostile professionals. As the director quoted above stated, an approach such as this explains why a project may be able to provide class advocacy without antagonizing those service systems providing services to individual clients also.

A related issue may be the fact that regardless of whether the advocacy activity is case or class-focused, the object or target of intervention for community-based projects tends to be a service system, institution or organization. It is not political action per se although political action to benefit all children may be far less threatening than political action to benefit the poor and minority groups. The avoidance of activity directed at increasing the political power of the consumer group may also contribute to the apparent lack of conflict between case and class advocacy in those projects incorporating both. Finally, one other possible reason for the potential compatibility of these two types of advocacy is that class advocacy may be the implicit long-term goal of all advocacy projects. In this context, case advocacy becomes the primary strategy for case finding and documentation of issues in class advocacy. For projects that view class advocacy as primary and case advocacy as the base from which it can be implemented, there should be no conflict since the interest of the individual clients would be expected to be subsumed under those of the group. Thus far, however, there are no actual illustrations of this approach and no data to support its viability in current practice.

Two other comments may be made about the types of advocacy provided. First, lay advocacy is overwhelmingly predominant at the community level. Where legal staff is employed, their role is essentially that of ancillary staff, specialists or consultants. The core project is lay-administered. Second, external advocacy, in contrast to internal advocacy, is equally predominant. There are only two internal advocacy projects in the group studied and one of these never even got off the ground. Internal advocacy, in particular, monitoring the services from within a single institution, is apparently much more difficult to implement than it appears. Obviously, one cannot draw any conclusions from a sample of two projects; yet it is interesting to note that the successful one of these two is strongly supported by the top administration in its sponsoring institution while the "failure" never obtained administrative support. Some possible questions that arise from this observation include: Can internal advocacy be implemented only when administrative support is present? (In a sense this means that it can be implemented where it may be least needed) Can internal advocacy ever be implemented without such support and if so, how? Another distinction between the two internal advocacy projects is that the "successful" one was clear about its advocacy objectives from the time it was first planned and anticipated a gradual structuring of the program throughout the initiation phase. The "failure" anticipated immediate action and after six months gave up trying to provide advocacy at all.

For almost all the projects providing case advocacy the individual case predominates as the entry point for advocacy. Three projects monitoring a local service system attempted to use this system as the entry point. The difference was that each of these projects used its staff in brokerage or liaison roles between itself and the target agency. In each project, the staff found themselves in conflict between the two organizations and in all three ended up dominated or co-opted by the target agency system. The problem seems to be that the monitoring role must be kept dominant; if the brokerage role assumes too much importance, the project may lose control of its staff.

Access and Advocacy

Considering the fact that case advocacy is the predominant type of advocacy at the community level and that over one half the projects studied (12) include the provision of access services (information, referral, brokerage) as clearly integral to the provision of case advocacy, it seems worthwhile to consider the possible implications of this relationship. Particularly noteworthy is the fact that all "successful" projects included a major access service component and defined it as an essential base for case advocacy. One project director commented that a network of locally based information and referral services would be an ideal way for developing a community-based case advocacy system. In effect, he saw a centrally organized, locally based access service program linked up to all the agencies in a city as providing a network of case advocacy projects. In addition, a centralized administrative office could correlate the categories of needs and problems identified at the neighborhood level and thus document and order issues for class advocacy. This suggestion for establishing a locally based access service system raises the issue of whether advocacy is more effective when provided as one part of a general service or when provided by an autonomous and specialized project. As yet, no systematic effort has been made to study such an alternative which relates not only to the distinction between the specialized advocacy practitioner and the general practitioner but highlights the specialist/generalist dichotomy with regard to the organization as a whole.

Advocacy Structures

This issue of the relationship of access services to advocacy raises a related issue also. That is the organizational structure of child advocacy projects and the kind of structure that most enhances the implementation of advocacy. One facet of this is the question raised above with regard to the autonomous, specialized project versus the supplemental component of a more generalized program. Another facet, however, is the type of organizational structure - bureaucratic or human relations - that most enhances or facilitates the provision of advocacy. Considering the fact that these projects all tend to resemble a human relations organization with regard to function and nature of tasks performed, almost all tend to be organized along traditional bureaucratic lines. Most have a three tier hierarchical structure with decision-making centralized in the hands of the director, supervision and training controlled by him and the assistant director, and services provided by direct line "advocate" staff. Superficially, at any rate, these projects seem to resemble a combination of both bureaucratic structure and human relations function.

Since there is some question as to the self-consciousness and deliberateness with which these projects develop their organizational structure, another area for further study might be a more intensive analysis of the relationship between the organizational structure of a project and eventual outcomes. For example, five of the projects have limited the number of targets addressed by them to a single target. Staff training is concentrated on providing relevant information, techniques for problem identification, solution and effective intervention, with regard to the specific project's target. In effect, staff become experts in dealing with these targets and are often more knowledgeable than members of the target system. Comparison of outcomes achieved by this kind of staff with specialized expertise, with more generally trained advocate staff in the other three "successful" projects might provide interesting data and be fruitfully incorporated into any instrument developed for outcome evaluation.

Advocate Staff

The projects are staffed predominantly by indigenous paraprofessionals (15 out of 23) most of whom are relatively inexperienced. On the other hand, projects are administered, almost without exception, by professionals (19 out of 23) who represent a wide variety of disciplines, such as early childhood education, special education, law, teaching, social work, psychology. Although in eight of the projects most staff have completed professional training, all directors stress the need for more experienced staff than initially employed and the need for more focused and extensive training for staff even when they are experienced.

Project directors continue to stress the importance of training yet training programs continue to be haphazard and weak. Very few even exist, let alone seem effective. The three that appear most worthwhile focus on providing substantive expertise regarding one target system or extensive and repeated training on an annual basis. In almost all projects, the request for training manuals, materials and general training expertise are ever present.

Related to the whole issue of training, in particular for paraprofessional staff, is the pervasive problem regarding the transferability of staff training, experience and expertise. In talking to staff in many of these projects as well as to their supervisors and administrators, grave concern is expressed for the future of competent paraprofessional staff whose lack of formal credentials limits their ability to obtain comparable jobs, in particular at a time when social programs are losing funding and personnel is being discharged. Therefore, it would seem essential that when planning training programs for staff, considerable thought be given to developing a work-study program with a neighboring college or university so that at least some credit can be earned towards an eventual degree. Where possible, preference should be for developing a training program which will culminate in at least an associate of arts degree.

There does not appear to be any significant difference between what either professionals, paraprofessionals or volunteers actually do when they "advocate." Certainly, case advocacy is as likely to be implemented effectively by paraprofessionals as professionals. As mentioned earlier, where class advocacy is concerned, there does seem to be a difference, that is, either specialized staff are involved or the administrators or directors of the project carry out class advocacy. This may indicate that provision of class advocacy requires professional staff. However, only further study can confirm this.

Finally, of the eighteen projects with paid staff (not just paid administrators) all have full-time staff, even though five initially employed part-time staff. Elimination of part-time employment is particularly characteristic of projects which stressed the hiring of indigenous paraprofessionals only. Although in some cases, staff said they needed full-time employment and pressured for their changed status, project directors generally claimed that part-time, paraprofessional employees were not an efficient and effective work force and that they required too substantial an investment in training and supervision to warrant the limited return provided from their part-time employment.

One last comment relates to the use of paraprofessional staff, the dominant staffing pattern in these projects. Indigenous paraprofessionals first became an important factor in staffing social programs during the 1960s in the anti-poverty programs. Their use, value, and the possible problems related to such staff have been extensively discussed elsewhere and their primary value identified as providing a bridge or link between professional staff and the immediate community.[1] (An alternative rationale stresses use of paraprofessionals in order to provide needed jobs.)

Although some of the problems identified in these projects have been recognized before, such as the issue of maintaining confidentiality regarding information about other members of the community, one particular problem seems underscored here. For the most part, these paraprofessionals are not being used as links with the community, but are rather being trained to work as pseudo-professionals, with the result that they often end up in a no mans land, with neither the credentials or expertise for professional jobs nor credibility in the community. It seems as if the concept of the worker as "bridge" has been rejected both by project administration and by staff. Although this is not a new problem, the consistency with which it appears in these projects may be indicative of the problem projects have generally with ensuring accountability to consumers. Projects have attempted several conventional approaches to providing client and consumer accountability, one of which is the use of indigenous staff. As will be discussed later, the inadequacy of existing devices for ensuring accountability may reflect the fact that the administration gets carried away by form and structure and fails to support the explicit function in practice. This problem of accountability and the confusion between structure and function will be discussed again.

---

[1] See Sherman Barr, "Some Observations on the Practice of Indigenous Non-Professional Workers," in Personnel in Anti-Poverty Programs: Implications for Social Work Education (New York: Council on Social Work Education, 1967) pp. 51-62; Gertrude Goldberg, "Non-Professionals in Human Services," in Charles Grosser, William E. Henry and James G. Kelly, eds., Non-professionals in the Human Services (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1969) pp. 12-39.

Leadership

At the completion of our national survey of child advocacy, we offered our impression that leadership was a crucial factor in developing a successful child advocacy project. This impression is more than confirmed by the findings of the current study. The role of leadership is critical in the planning phase of child advocacy projects - from the importance of individual initiative in stimulating the planning process and the active involvement of leadership throughout the process, to the importance of leadership responsibility for the preparation and submission of a formal proposal. It is critical again in the initiation phase where continuity of leadership between planning and initiation becomes essential. Successful initiation of child advocacy projects is characterized, without exception, by the high quality of leadership from the beginning of the project through later development. Finally, the little evidence this study provides regarding successful implementation, seems to indicate that leadership continuity **remains** important and that the commitment of leadership to the project is an essential factor.

Child advocacy represents an effort at innovative programming. Where a new concept of program or practice is being implemented, strong leadership becomes essential. Although styles of leadership may vary from the charismatic to the low-keyed and understated, all the successful projects in the study are directed by someone who understands the conceptual framework of the project and is overwhelmingly committed to its goals and objectives. In addition, when the leader of a successful project leaves, the project often shows signs of retrogression.

It is worth noting that the importance of leadership in implementing a new project is a factor that has been commented on elsewhere, both in theory as well as in practice.[1]

---

[1] For another perspective on leadership, see George A. Brager and Harry Specht, Community Organizing, Part I, pp. 3-66; Neil Gilbert, Armin Rosenkranz and Specht, "Dialectics of Social Planning," Social Service Review, Vol. 18, No. 2, March 1973, pp. 78-86.

In another context, Sylvia Porter, writing about the importance of leadership and management in business, says, "In an overwhelming nine out of ten cases, the reason underlying a business failure will be the manager's incompetence, inexperience, ineptitude." She implies further, that in a variety of organizations - both profit and non-profit - the leadership factor is a critical variable. (New York Post, May 4, 1973)

In one study effective implementation is defined as being contingent on strong leadership in the planning phase.

> ...the key to effective implementation is, of course, the degree of commitment to the change felt by certain key participants who must implement it. While an organization can afford to have some members who will comply with the new requirements with but faint enthusiasm and a very few who are in active opposition, most of the key figures need both understanding and emotional commitment if important and lasting change is to be effective. This understanding and commitment needs to be built during the diagnostic and planning phases. If it is achieved at these phases, the implementation will predictably go relatively smoothly.[1]

An even stronger and more comprehensive statement of the importance of project leadership is made in a report put out by the Ford Foundation on the evaluation of its own school project during the 1960s. One of the conclusions of this study is that "... the success or failure of the project probably was determined more by the performance and continued service of the project director than by any other single factor."[2] Further confirmation of this point of view may be found in the subsequent statement that "...there was a distinct tendency in most cases for the director who was present at the creation (of the new project) to remain faithful to the project..,"[3] while project directors who were selected after a grant was made tended to have both more limited leadership capacity as well as more limited commitment to project goals and objectives. Finally, the Ford report comments on the fact that high dependence of projects on individual leaders was compounded by their high rate of turnover. Thus, when directors changed, the basic interests and capabilities of the projects changed. "Existent priorities were abandoned or neglected, new ones were established, and resources had to be devoted to gearing-up again and resolving the uncertainties that accompany that process. In a few instances, the replacement of directors led to project improvements, but in most the effect was detrimental."[1] Similarly, for this group of child advocacy projects, at least half the directors changed within the first two years of the project's existence, with similar negative consequences. An even clearer indication of this problem may be seen in a project which appeared highly successful when initially visited in the course of this study. When re-visited six months later, five months after the director resigned to return to graduate school and three months after the assistant director left, the project had lost its "sense of direction," the program had changed and staff morale had deteriorated.

---

[1] Lawrence and Lorsch, *op*. *cit*., p. 88.

[2] *A Foundation Goes to School*, The Ford Foundation Comprehensive School Improvement Program, 1960-70, p. 33. (Emphasis added)

[3] *Ibid*., p. 34.

Boards: Structure and Function

Establishing a board (advisory or policy-making; lay professional or both; consumer, elite or combination; actively participating or ad hoc) is one of the major organizational tasks for new child advocacy projects. Of the twenty-three projects studied, ten had no board at the time visited, either through deliberate choice or because of problems in the organization and establishment of a board. The remaining thirteen had some form of board, usually advisory, and usually meeting on an ad hoc basis (if at all) with little input into the project. Two projects had policy-making boards composed of a combination of elites and professionals. In one, consumers were included also. In ten projects, all members were appointed to the board by the project director and specifically selected because of their commitment and enthusiasm for the project's objectives. One other project has a similarly composed advisory board. Three projects established policy-making boards with membership elected by community residents and of these two were defunct by the end of the first year and the third was in such difficulty that the director did not call for new elections at the end of the board's term of office and the project was without a board for six months before the second efforts were made at organizing a board.

---

[1] *Ibid.*, pp. 33-34.

Six of the projects, funded by one federal agency were under heavy pressure to establish an elected policy-making board with substantial community representation and to do it within the first year of the project's life. The two projects that attempted this had problems throughout the year as a result. Two of the other projects established an appointed advisory board and were faulted for this while the remaining two established no board at all. Several other projects were under similar but less intense pressure to do the same thing.

After visiting twelve projects and interviewing as many directors it seemed obvious that establishing such a board presented substantial problems for every project. In an effort at obtaining some additional perspective, several directors of older child advocacy projects or other community action programs were questioned as to the viability of elected, policy-making boards. Without exception, the eight directors interviewed all stated that establishing such a board composed of elected community representatives, required at least two years of concerted effort; for it to become involved in making policy also, required another two years. Thus, criticism of these child advocacy projects for not establishing such boards after one year of operation, seems highly unreasonable and unrealistic.

In reviewing the experience of several other projects, certain characteristics appear to affect the length of time it takes for a board to become operational and the type of problems that may emerge in the process. For example, boards composed solely of elites and professionals take the least time to be organized and become functioning. Although boards composed of lay people only may have difficulty in defining role and function, boards composed of both professionals and lay people (or consumers) with the latter group less educated, unsophisticated and inexperienced (or a board composed of experienced adults and inexperienced youth) are most difficult to organize and to get operating. In four projects where boards were similar to that described above (professionals and inexperienced youth) the professionals or the adults tended to dominate and either the other members withdrew or became actively hostile, creating constant internecine conflict within the board.

One project director suggested that if the establishment of an elected policy-making board composed of community residents was supposed to be a major project objective, a structured approach to phasing-in the board should be followed. For example, he suggested that six months be spent in organizing the community, identifying issues and preparing for elections; three months should be spent in training those people elected for membership on the board in their roles, duties and board procedures. This should be done as a first step in establishing a new project before any other part of the program is developed.

> Administrators and funders should be prepared for project directors to spend the first six to nine months just getting a board organized. It has to take at least one year for the organizational structure of staff and board to learn to work together before a program can begin to be established, let alone become operational.

An alternative approach to supporting community participation was suggested by two other directors. Their idea was that projects should establish two advisory boards, one composed of professionals and elites and the other composed of consumers and lay people. Only when the lay board becomes really cohesive and self-confident should the two be integrated.

A third suggestion, and like the previous ones made also by the director of a child advocacy project located in a minority community, was that elected membership could work only if the community was highly organized and had a strong sense of community cohesion.[1] In fragmented or dispersed communities only appointed boards can be established, and be effective.

The directors of six projects located in ghetto communities and serving minority populations all stressed the fact that the elected boards were a waste of time and effort. One said "appointed, committed people who have expertise is far more important than holding elections and having a representative board, especially since such boards are never really representative."

SANCTION, LEGITIMACY, AND ACCOUNTABILITY

Establishing a board - one of several organizational tasks in the initiation phase of project development - receives exaggerated importance by project directors because it is defined as so important by funding agencies. It is certainly not a primary factor influencing the success or failure of child advocacy projects. Indeed, it is a perfect illustration of the inappropriate weighting given to a structural variable without analyzing its relevance for goal achievement. The important question is what is the function of a board? Is this function essential for the effective development of a child advocacy project? Is the board the only device for provision of this function? Among the more important functions of a board are: to provide sanction and legitimacy for the project, to provide a channel for community participation in the program and to ensure accountability to consumers and other groups within the community.

---

[1] Or, to use Kramer's terms, a "competent community" is essential for the development of a "competent program." Kramer, op. cit., p. 203.

The traditional policy-making boards in voluntary organizations provide power, sanction and legitimacy from the fact that they control the actual source of funds. Often they either give the funds directly, represent groups which provide funds (e.g., foundations) or do direct fund raising. Since money is the single most important factor influencing project development, controlling the source of money becomes equally important in influencing, if not determining policy. In such organizations the board selects the executive director and makes all major policy decisions.

In contrast to this, boards of publicly owned corporations are handmaidens of management. They are selected by management, identified with it, and are essentially advisory, not policy-making. Unless there is a fight for control of the organization, they always back management and never determine policy independently. They change at the direction of management or when management changes. In such situations the board provides sanction or legitimacy by supporting "the project director" and reinforcing his leadership and position.

For these child advocacy projects the one thing the board does **not** do is directly control the funds, thus it cannot provide sanction and legitimacy in this way. In some cases, however, it does function as back-up and support - both advisor and "claque" - to the project director; but in those instances the board tends to be ad hoc, meet irregularly and have little influence. In reality, the major issue involved in stressing the importance of a board, is the search for ensuring accountability. Unfortunately, the assumption is that the board is the only device that can achieve this. When public funding is supporting an organization, by definition the organization must be accountable both to the public at large (thus the community in which the project is located) and the public it addresses (its specific consumers). Community representation on boards becomes a false issue masking the real one of community accountability. Although electing representatives to the board of a project is one way of providing accountability, several other ways exist also.

Furthermore, electing representative board members who are not committed to project goals and are not prepared to make a substantial investment in time and energy in board activities will not provide any more accountability to consumers - and probably less - than members who are deliberately selected from among those consumers who appear particularly interested, competent, have time and are willing to work. If a project wants to demonstrate its representativeness, one other way it can do this is by hiring indigenous staff or staff representative of consumer groups (although there are potential problems with this approach also, as mentioned earlier). Other approaches include two projects where consumers were hired to work with those planning the project (a variation on advocacy planning); in another, groups of consumers were organized to evaluate the project's activities and services. The latter is the nearest thing to an innovative device that appears to exist; most approaches to ensuring accountability exist more in rhetoric than in practice. Unfortunately, this study confirmed the conclusions of the earlier one, that there is great need for new social invention in this field. Project planners, directors and funders talk about accountability but little is actually being done about it.

SUMMARY

In summary, the present study confirmed the importance of certain variables initially identified impressionistically as important: funding agency influences; advocacy objectives, processes and targets; the relationship of goals, process and structure; the overriding importance of leadership. It identified certain other variables whose importance was not adequately recognized in the earlier study, in particular the nature of the target community and the existence and extensiveness of staff training. It reinforced initial concern regarding the exaggerated importance placed on certain structural variables, in particular, the board. Finally, it confirmed the existence of a vacuum surrounding the development of devices and other forms of social invention to ensure accountability. This becomes particularly critical for advocacy projects which are presumed to act as spokesmen for their consumers and thus must invent mechanisms that guarantee such accountability.

CHAPTER IX

REFLECTIONS

This study was designed: a) to describe the process by which community-based child advocacy projects are started and become operational; b) to identify possible patterns in this process and conceptualize them; and c) to learn from a review and analysis of the process what kind of strategy - and what kinds of criteria - could be developed for evaluation purposes.

The process has been described and analyzed. It should be noted, first, that the process itself is substantially more complex and takes far more time than is generally known or recognized. Second, it was discovered that developmental phases could be identified and conceptualized: planning, initiation and implementation. Third, phase-specific criteria were developed for evaluation purposes, but the initial expectation that impact or outcome criteria would also be identified, proved not to be feasible. In the course of discovering how long a project takes to become operational it became overwhelmingly clear that one criterion for sample selection - the two and one-half year age limit on projects - had, in effect, eliminated almost all projects that might have been far enough along developmentally. Thus, the study sample simply could not provide an adequate empirical base from which such outcome criteria could be developed.[1]

The study was planned to include efforts at both formative evaluation (assessing local efforts to identify effective strategies and project development) and summative evaluation (assessing the impact of the program, in particular at the over-all level).[2] Again, only criteria for formative evaluation could be developed, because the vast majority of projects were not at a stage where summative evaluation was appropriate, reasonable or feasible. What became important, therefore, was to identify and analyze the factors precluding other types of evaluation. In short, why was it not possible to look at effects and effectiveness and to review and assess output systematically? Included among the exploratory variables are: the number and types of tasks accomplished between the time a project is funded and when it first begins to provide advocacy services, activities or actions regularly; how long a period of time this process takes; and finally, what factors seem to make a difference along the way. (With reference to the latter, it proved easier to identify factors positively correlated with failure than those positively correlated with success)

---

[1] However, some tentative comments will be made later in the chapter about impact and outcome criteria.

[2] See Chapter II for some discussion of this distinction and relevant bibliographical references.

In effect, then, this study has concentrated on evaluation of "program effort," "program process" and "program strategy," rather than "program output" or "program efficiency."[1] The study findings offer guidance to planners, project directors, and funders; for planners designing a new project; for project directors viewing their own project development; for funders in assessment of proposals for new projects as well as in the monitoring of ongoing project development.

WHAT ELSE HAS BEEN LEARNED ABOUT EVALUATING CHILD ADVOCACY PROJECTS?

Analysis and Assessment of Proposals as the First Stage of Project Evaluation

Employing the classification scheme developed in the course of this study and the differentiating criteria derived empirically for each developmental phase, an initial instrument was developed for evaluating child advocacy projects. The instrument was tested in the field. Findings, conclusions and appropriate revisions to facilitate further use were suggested in Chapter VII. It now seems apparent that successful community-based child advocacy projects are few in number. Moreover, projects rarely move from failure in one stage to success later on. In reviewing all the projects, it seems clear that poorly planned projects - those characterized by numerous indicia of difficulty in the planning process - are not able to be successfully implemented. Indeed, although successful planning does not necessarily ensure successful implementation, unsuccessful, inadequate or poor planning does appear to preclude success at later stages. It is obvious therefore, that the planning phase is crucial; indeed it is the first stage in project development requiring evaluation. In effect, study findings highlight the importance of meticulous review by funders of proposals submitted to them and provide guidelines for such analysis and assessment. Careful analysis and review of proposals, site visits, and interviews with relevant planners, potential consumers and community groups all should be considered before final approval is given to proposals for community-based child advocacy projects. Rhetoric, diffuse goals, lack of a clear conceptual framework, failure to obtain community sanction, all represent warning signals and indicia of potential difficulty. Leadership initiation, involvement and active participation in planning and preparation of the proposal; involvement and active participation of relevant elements in the community; and precision and specificity in task or problem identification as well as goals and strategies, seem essential ingredients for "successful planning."

---

[1] See Suchman, Evaluation Research; Tripodi, Fellin and Epstein, *op. cit.*; Wholey, *op. cit.* for discussion of these types of evaluation. Also, Chapter II.

Clearly, there is no longer any excuse for funding proposals labeled "child advocacy" that show no evidence whatsoever of advocacy-type objectives and interventions. Furthermore, enough is known now about these projects to avoid supporting probable failures. Several principal investigators of federally funded child advocacy projects commented critically on the poor quality of proposals funded (often including their own). In discussing their own and other proposals, several suggested that funding agencies could enforce much sharper criteria, in particular, requirements for far clearer delineations of project goals and a clearer concept of project design and objectives. Subsequent research devoted to empirical study of other types of social programs - and other types of organizations - regarding how they begin and develop, might reveal how many of these criteria are valid for these also, or whether they are only "child advocacy-specific."

The Second Stage for Evaluation: Project Initiation

Establishing a project after it is funded takes substantially more time than project directors, funders, or outside evaluators anticipate. Only one of the newly established, autonomous projects (as contrasted with components of existing projects) was able to be organized in less than one year. In general, the process of recruiting and obtaining staff, training them, finding physical space (an office), mobilizing a constituency, identifying specific action targets and strategies, and finally beginning advocacy activities - whether case or class - appears to require at least one year and in several cases, fifteen to eighteen months. Indeed, a more hasty approach to accomplishing this seems to result in a variety of problems (inadequately trained staff, lack of community support, inappropriately identified and selected targets and strategies). Time and deliberation appear essential where new program models and innovative service strategies are being developed and provided.

Evaluation of project initiation is particularly sensitive because it is in this phase that a somewhat symbiotic relationship between project monitors and the projects, as entities, begins to emerge. In effect, project monitors do not watch for critical milestones and draw necessary conclusions. Instead, they often seem to develop a vested interest in the continuity of projects, and a project may be refunded even though it would seem obvious to any independent observer that it is in grave difficulty (perhaps it is easier both for project officers and for projects to get funds to continue an existing project than to fund a new one). Yet, in reality, in real experiments, failure - and knowing what leads to failure - is as important as success. Failure must therefore be faced and labeled as such. As G. K. Chesterton said, "If a thing is worth doing, it is worth doing badly." If that were kept in mind, project monitors might not need to support a project's continuity, regardless of performance, defensively insisting that it is really a "success."

Implementation Capacity as a Primary Focus for Evaluation

Again, attaining the implementation stage of project development and completing it takes far more time than was previously recognized. Only three of the projects in this sample of twenty-three reached this point and they tended to be the oldest in the sample. For these, successful implementation seemed to be predicated on successful planning and initiation, although one project that seemed in difficulty in the initiation phase began moving towards successful implementation by substantially redesigning its program.

Two issues emerged during review of this phase of project development: The first is that projects may be evaluated as successfully implemented at one point in time and then retrogress. Several variables may account for this, and will be discussed in greater detail subsequently. The second is the importance of seeking out and identifying criteria for evaluating the implementation capacity of a new project. In fact, the very nature of the study made this an implicit if inadvertent and unanticipated focus. Thus, the study has highlighted an evaluative area which has received little attention previously.

In _Social Policy and Analysis_, Walter Williams comments that:

> At the heart of the problem of moving from a decision to a program in the field are two complex factors: program specification and implementation capacity. The

> first concerns how well specified a proposal needing implementation is. Does a decision to start a new program in the field rest on a sound blueprint for action derived from extensive study and testing on a small scale, or from a vaguely delineated desire to solve a problem? The second factor concerns an agency's capability to implement a decision once it is made. Does the agency have the personnel and organization capability needed to carry out the program as specified in the design? When a program does poorly in the field, it is almost impossible to disentangle the unique negative contribution of the design specification underlying the decision from the subsequent implementation. But together these two problems loom as the biggest substantive (as opposed to purely monetary or political) hurdles to better social programs.[1]

He continues by stating that over a wide range of social action programs

> ...the experience seems to emphasize, over and over again, the difficulty of bridging the gap between programs so conceived and workable field operations. And a critical missing link is empirical and conceptual information directly addressing questions of program design, organization, and operation.[2]

He concludes, a few pages later by stating that this problem of implementation has been ignored by both project directors and decision makers as a critical factor in evaluation of effects and effectiveness; that outcome and impact evaluation criteria must be based on an understanding of implementation capacity; that the assessment of this capacity is basic to any decisions and recommendations regarding programs; and that "the capacity to implement programs is a legitimate and challenging area, the importance of which in terms of program operations should make it a high-priority target for policy research."[1]

---

[1] Williams, Social Policy Research, p. 4.

[2] Ibid., pp. 4-5 (emphasis author's).

This study was designed to provide empirical and conceptual information about child advocacy projects, addressing questions of project design, organization and operations. Initially, it was assumed that this would permit development of criteria for outcome evaluation. It did not, for reasons mentioned previously. Instead, however, without conscious intent or plan, what emerged as a major focus of the study is this problem of implementation capacity: the identification of those factors which permit a project to bring together human and other resources in a cohesive organizational unit and motivate them in such a way as to carry out the project's stated objectives. This is what is involved in the successful planning and initiation of a project. It is for the purpose of evaluating implementation capacity that the identification of criteria for evaluating each developmental phase becomes so important. The unique problem for child advocacy projects is that even when one identifies these criteria and demonstrates what might be termed program competence, we are still faced with a subsequent and, at least for this researcher, an unforeseen problem. That is, having identified projects rated high on implementation capacity (high in planning and initiation) or even having identified projects that have been successfully implemented, then what?

---

[1] Ibid., p. 16.

In the course of testing the initial evaluation instrument, certain projects were visited which earlier appeared to be implementing their programs as planned. Yet, six to eight months later the nature of the program had changed sharply, and in one instance the project seemed on the verge of collapse. Although, as indicated in Chapter VII, reasons for all these changes seemed readily apparent (e.g., changed leadership; changed political climate; changed or lost funding), the problem remains. Is this a reflection of inadequacies in the criteria for evaluating a project's implementation status, or does it imply, rather, something else about these projects?

The Risks of Social Experimentation

In effect, the difficulty of fixing or stabilizing innovative programs underscores one of the major risks in social experimentation generally. In fact, it may be this instability that is so critical in inhibiting the development of measures for outcome or impact evaluation. The very nature of these projects - innovative, experimental - implies great fluidity in programming and a high risk of failure. Projects evolve in real life and thus respond to the real world around them.

Leaders may leave and the project may lose its sense of direction. The kinds of people who get involved in initiating such projects tend to drift to other projects, organizations, ideas, for a variety of reasons. Sometimes they leave because the project has not worked.

Many directors of child advocacy projects began with great enthusiasm and left after two years of frustration.. One problem is the unrealistic expectations most directors have for project development. Perhaps the findings of this study may help to set more realistic standards and expectations and provide a more viable framework for future project developers. Others leave because the project has worked, the initial task has been accomplished, and they are bored and seek out a new challenge. Sometimes, their success stimulates other offers, with more important or rewarding opportunities, and so they leave. As was discussed in the last chapter, regardless of the type of project, program or organization, the departure of project leadership has negative consequences. It may leave the project temporarily rudderless; without control and direction, it regresses. Or the project may change direction sharply, again, usually for the worse.

In one apparently successful project, loss of the project director and assistant director not only left the project without leadership, but it eliminated the project's main contact with the community. Thus, another potential risk is that community participation may be eliminated because the project loses its indigenous staff or community board members move away and the project has no other sustained bridge to the community.

A third risk of social experimentation is that the political climate may change, leading to loss of funding, increased community resistance to a particular type of project, decreased tolerance for conflict or unwillingness on the part of project administration to take risks. The Nixon administration's attitude towards social programming generally affected many communities visited in the course of the field test, several months after the 1972 election and after newly elected local officials took office. The concept of active intervention - changing established agencies, organizations and institutions - was viewed with far less tolerance than one year earlier. Directors seemed far more fearful of conflict or aggressive action than earlier.

Fourth, as indicated earlier, money - funding - plays an enormously important role in the development of these projects. Although the implicit premise on which research and demonstration projects receive federal funding is that such funding will be continued if the project is proved successful, in fact this is often not true. Success may be meaningless, as indicated above, if the political climate changes. Inevitably, the loss of funding that may occur under such circumstances (or the changed source of funding) plays an important role in project continuity or the stability of programming. Thus, what appeared to be the most successful of all the projects studied closed when it lost its funding as a result of the severe cutbacks in OEO programs. A second project, which had also appeared to be on the way to successful implementation, was informed its funding would end in Fiscal Year '74. Seeking out new financing to stay alive, it obtained assurance of state mental health funds if the project would redefine its objectives and strategies. Currently, it appears to be changing from an active advocacy project to a traditional direct service, counseling and guidance project with some provision of information and referral services. Its advocacy activities are being phased out, although the label remains.

Since advocacy implies constant responsiveness to needs, and needs change, advocacy projects must be fluid. As organizations, they must constantly address the problem of self-renewal. For example, a project may initially focus on advocacy to achieve one objective. At the community level, as we have indicated, this tends to be a limited objective. Once it is achieved, a portion of the whole developmental process begins again - new objectives must be specified and new strategies selected and applied. In part, success for an advocacy project requires constant risk. Indeed, the most successful are always cliff-hangers, remaining on the verge of trying something new, and thus risking failure. If projects become fearful, fixed and rigid, they lose this primary characteristic, and then by definition, they are failures.

Some Thoughts about Outcome and Impact Criteria

Unfortunately, little data obtained in this study support any clear concept of what criteria for advocacy outcome and impact measures might be. Few projects were far enough along to have identified such criteria for themselves, and even among these, change and regression were apparent by the end of the study.

Some "project-specific" criteria emerged from review of individual, specialized advocacy projects, however. For example, a student advocacy project concentrating on a single target, such as a school system, might employ such measures as: new courses added to the school curriculum; increased participation of students and/or parents in making school policy; development of formal grievance procedures; increased school expenditures; revised rules for school suspension; court decisions supporting students' rights to due process of law.

Advocacy projects addressing the juvenile justice system might use such measures as: reduced rates of institutionalization; reduced incidence of remand; increased numbers of alternative youth services. Possible measures for health advocacy projects might include: extended clinic hours; reduced waiting time; improved physical access; increased rates of service use.

Although difficult, it is obviously simpler to develop measures for specialized projects than it is to invent common measures for evaluating child advocacy projects generally. General "categories" for such measures could probably be separated into measures for assessing effective case advocacy and measures for assessing effective class advocacy. For the former, these might include: the number and type of services provided where none previously existed; the number and type of services obtained after initial refusal or denial of service; the number of legal rights and entitlements obtained; individual legal actions taken and won. For class advocacy: criteria might include the relative number of changes in specified policies, administrative procedures, personnel, rules, budgets, laws, legal class actions.

In employing such measures, it would seem essential that criteria so identified would be assigned differential weighting. For example, advocacy actions resulting in the elimination of a state-wide law permitting corporal punishment in a school system employing such punishment frequently might receive a very different weighting than changing a rule regarding use of a school gymnasium on weekends by senior high school students. Such weighting would have to reflect both quantitative impact (the numbers of children and/or families affected) as well as qualitative impact (some judgement as to the importance of the change).

CHILD ADVOCACY: A FINAL LOOK

As mentioned in Chapter I, shortly after beginning the 1971-72 study of child advocacy, we concluded that child advocacy was a fad, the label merely a funding gimmick, and that it covered a mass of disparate and confused functions and activities. In time, we changed our perspective, identified what seemed to be a new phenomenon, with some underlying coherence and cohesiveness. Based on what we saw and heard, we defined a concept of child advocacy. Two years have passed since then. The concept remains exciting, relevant, and functional. "Child Advocacy" seems to have stimulated a wide range of activities, and some people are continuing to do exciting things. But as a programmatic phenomenon, on the community level, at least, child advocacy seems to be short-lived. Projects that appeared failures initially still seem so; projects that appeared successful have either lost their funding and closed, changed their source of financial support and relinquished their advocacy character to adapt to other funding agency guidelines, or lost their leadership and thus their mission. The weaker projects have turned to traditional direct service provision, if - or perhaps in order to be - funded. Stronger ones, if still funded and moving forward, are stressing provision of access services, with case advocacy as one component of their total program. Certainly among the projects included in this study, advocacy seems diluted or increasingly non-existent.

Yet the need for advocacy continues. What has been termed a community conscience is essential if children are to be protected against inadequate laws or unresponsive services and institutions. Advocacy projects function as watchdogs, monitors, regulators or what Ralph Nader has termed "whistle blowers,"[1] with regard to other systems. In effect, one function of an advocacy project is to provide a mechanism for ensuring quality control in service delivery. If this is defined as an essential social need, the question becomes, how does one decide on the adequacy of the dollar investment in such a system? How much money should be invested in analyzing the potential impact of new legislation on children and their families? How could one evaluate the effectiveness of such projects?

When a business decides to establish a quality control system, its decision is based on a whole series of variables including the dollar loss - and the number of complaints generated by poor quality of the goods produced. True, it may not be a worthwhile expenditure to eliminate all complaints, but a cost/benefit analysis is possible. As yet, our society has not even defined failure to take up service, benefits, or entitlements, as a "cost." In fact, in certain segments of our society this non-use is defined in reverse terms, as benefit - the lower the take-up, the lower the cost. Similarly, society has not defined "complaints" about service provision and unresponsiveness (poor quality services) as a "cost." Obviously when one segment of society defines "cost" as what another defines as "benefit," neither cost/benefit studies nor precise "hard" evaluation can be satisfactorily implemented.

---

[1] Ralph Nader, Peter Petkas, and Kate Blackwell, eds., Whistle Blowing (New York: Bantam Books, 1972).

James Q. Wilson, commenting on the problems and difficulties of evaluating the impact of broad-aim, social, or what he terms public policy programs, suggests two general laws:[1]

> FIRST LAW: All policy interventions in social problems produce the intended effect - _if_ the research is carried out by those implementing the policy or their friends.
>
> SECOND LAW: No policy intervention in social problems produces the intended effect - _if_ the research is carried out by independent third parties, especially those skeptical of the policy.

Wilson thus suggests the inevitable frustration inherent in trying to make policy decisions based on precise knowledge about program results when value elements loom large in regard to the criteria. Yet, he concludes by stating that regardless of the fact that making a policy decision to proceed with a particular type of program is a value decision, attempts at improving the bases for evaluative studies are essential. Once social choices are made, they should and can be made visible and goal measures sought.

We now have a picture of child advocacy at the community level and we know something about what precludes successful implementation of advocacy activities. However, having described what goes on, does not mean that there cannot be change or improvement; because projects develop the way they do, does not mean that the whole process is inevitable. Quite the contrary. Although most of these projects have had a large number of problems, no systematic data or experience was available to guide or assist them prior to this study. By identifying what must be accomplished in setting up new projects, and what the potential problems are, this study has tried to provide such information. Hopefully, forewarned is forearmed.

---

[1] James Q. Wilson, "On Pettigrew and Armor: and Afterword," _The Public Interest_, No. 30, Winter, 1973, p. 133 (132-34).

However, we know much less about what facilitates or assures successful implementation of advocacy activities. Clearly, further study is needed of "successful" advocacy projects when they are identified. Nor do we know what the effect of advocacy - of these actions taken by advocacy projects - is, on the agencies, institutions, organizations, groups, it tries to change, or what its impact is on the community at large. Although advocacy undoubtedly will continue in a myriad of ways - as part of individual or organizational roles - we are not even sure if it can, will, or should survive, as an organized entity or phenomenon. The study of child advocacy, as a continuing and sustained organizational phenomenon - how advocacy can best be implemented and what its effects and effectiveness may be - remains a research challenge for the future.

A. COMMUNITY-BASED CHILD ADVOCACY PROJECTS

PARTICIPATING IN STUDY

1. Alemada County Mental Health Association*
   Tri-City Child Advocacy Project
   1610 Harrison Street
   Oakland, California 94612

2. Center for the Study of Student Citizenship, Rights and Responsibilities*
   1145 Germantown Street
   Dayton, Ohio 45408

3. Child Advocacy Group*
   Denver General Hospital
   7th and Cherokee
   Denver, Colorado 80204

4. Child Advocacy System Project*
   Learning Institute of North Carolina
   1006 Lamond Avenue
   Durham, North Carolina 27701

5. Citizen Advocacy Program*
   55 High Street
   Mt. Holly, New Jersey 08060

6. East Nashville-Caldwell Child Advocacy Project*
   Meridian and Berry Streets
   Nashville, Tennessee

7. Family Development Center
   Family Service Agency of San Francisco
   3555 Army Street
   San Francisco, California 94110

8. Holly Park Child Advocacy Demonstration Project
   2907 So. Van Asselt Court
   Seattle, Washington 98118

---

*Child Advocacy Projects for which case studies were done in the earlier study (1971-72).

9. Hough Parent and Child Center
Advocacy Component
7724 Lexington Avenue
Cleveland, Ohio 44103

10. Institute for Child Advocacy*
Central City Community Health Center
4305 South Broadway
Los Angeles, California 90037

11. Martin Luther King, Jr.
Parent and Child Advocacy Center
560 North Broadway
Baltimore, Maryland 21205

12. Mexican American Neighborhood
Civic Organization*
Child Advocacy Project
1506 S.W. 19th Street
San Antonio, Texas 78207

13. Parent Child Center
Child Advocacy Program*
188 Geneva Avenue
Dorchester, Massachusetts 02121

14. Philadelphia Urban League
Child Advocacy Project*
644 North 52nd Street
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19131

15. Queens Lay Advocate Service
149-05 79th Avenue
Flushing, New York 11367

16. Social Advocates for Youth*
315 Montgomery Street, Suite #1014
San Francisco, California 94104

Social Advocates for Youth
218 "E" Street
Santa Rosa, California
95404

17. Social Advocates for Youth*
5973 Encina
Goleta, California 93017

18. South End Family Service Agency
200 East 29th Street
Little Rock, Arkansas 72206

19. West Nashville Youth Service*
3420 Richards Street
Nashville, Tennessee 37215

20. Western Carolina Center*
    Morganton, North Carolina

21. Working Together for Children
    Child Advocacy Program*
    Prince George's County Public Schools
    Upper Marlboro, Maryland 20870

22. Youth Advocacy Program of St. Joseph County*
    509 West Washington Street
    South Bend, Indiana

23. Youth Services Agency
    392-13th Avenue
    Newark, New Jersey 07103

B. LETTER EXPLAINING STUDY TO PROJECT DIRECTORS

The Columbia University School of Social Work | *New York, N.Y. 10025*

Child Advocacy Research Project
622 West 113th Street

October 6, 1972

Dear

We have just completed a national survey of child advocacy programs. Publication of our monograph, entitled CHILD ADVOCACY: A NATIONAL BASELINE STUDY, is scheduled for November, 1972 and distribution will follow shortly thereafter. The report will include our findings and an overall description and analysis of current developments in the field. We hope you will find it of interest. You, of course, will receive an early copy. Needless to say, we are most appreciative of your past cooperation.

We are continuing our study of child advocacy, again under the auspices of the Office of Child Development. This year's study will concentrate on two facets of community-based child advocacy programs: 1) Program Developments (how child advocacy programs become operational; what kinds of criteria can be employed for purposes of evaluation); and 2) Practice-Methods and Techniques (in particular, what workers do when they function as child advocates.

The first phase of our study on program development involves identifying the stages and steps by which programs become operational. We are interested in such questions as: how and by whom a program is developed; when, how and by whom staff, board and constituencies are selected; targets identified; interventive strategies developed; what kinds of problems arise during the first year following funding and how are they overcome? Our purpose here is to arrive at some concept of normal developmental patterns for community-based child advocacy programs in order to develop guidelines for other newly established programs. In addition we hope to provide a framework within which we can begin to develop criteria for evaluation purposes.

Your program is one of those we very much hope to include in our new study. Participation in this study would require about one half day of agency time. I would want to interview those people most directly involved with the formulation of the program (who wrote the proposal if one was written; who initiated the program; who administered it initially as well as the current administrator.) I would also like to read any relevant material, such as a proposal, minutes etc.

I shall telephone you in about a week, hoping to arrange a convenient time for my visit. Once again, I want to thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely yours,

Sheila B. Kamerman
Project Director.

11/13/72

C. INTERVIEW GUIDE FOR PHASING-IN STUDY

NAME OF PROGRAM ____________________

ADDRESS ____________________

____

TELEPHONE NUMBER ____________________

DATE PROGRAM WAS ESTABLISHED ____________________

DATE PROGRAM WAS FUNDED (if different from above) ____________________

NAME OF PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR ____________________

ADDRESS ____________________

____

TELEPHONE NUMBER ____________________

NAME OF DIRECTOR (if different from above) ____________________

ADDRESS ____________________

____

TELEPHONE NUMBER ____________________

DATE FIRST EMPLOYED BY PROGRAM ____________________

KEY PEOPLE IN GETTING PROGRAM GOING ____________________

____

(Names, where located, can they be interviewed?) ____________________

____

____

____

IS THE PROGRAM FULLY OPERATING NOW? ____________________

CURRENT ANNUAL BUDGET ____________________

SOURCE OF FUNDING (major) % ____________________ (other) % ____________________

PLANNING PRIOR TO INITIATION:

WHAT (WHEN, WHO, WHERE, WHY, HOW) STIMULATED THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE PROPOSAL OR PROGRAM?
a) availability of new funds; b) recognized problem or need in the community; c) pressures from the community or other groups; d) decision of sponsoring agency; e) individual initiatives; other influences

WAS A FORMAL PROPOSAL DEVELOPED FOR THE PROGRAM?

If so, is a copy available?
Who was involved in preparing this proposal?
If others besides the director, can they be interviewed?
  How and Where?
How long did it take for the proposal to be formulated?
Was technical assistance provided by any other organization or individual? (OCD staff, NIMH/BEH staff, other HEW staff, professional proposal writer, etc.)

IF NO FORMAL PROPOSAL WAS DEVELOPED, WAS THERE SOME OTHER KIND OF FORMAL OR INFORMAL PLANNING PRIOR TO THE PROGRAM'S INITIATION?

What was it? (memo, document, report)
By Whom?
What was its nature?
How long did it take?

FINANCING

How were funds obtained for the program? (Who contacted whom, what was process)
How long did it take to obtain funding?
How are funds channelled into the program?
Did any problems arise regarding funding?
  If yes, what kinds, why, what happened?
Did the program change during the course of looking for funds?
  If so, how?
Source of initial funding
Amount
For how long a period?
Was this the total budget?
  If not, what was the source of additional funds and how much were they?
How and by whom is fiscal control exercised?

AUSPICES:

What are they?
What is the nature of the relationship between program and auspices?
Has the auspice restricted or influenced the program in any way?
If so, what etc.

GOALS:

What were you trying to achieve? (goals and targets)
Who decided these, when, by what means? (director alone; in conjunction with others; what others; sponsor, etc.
Did other people have other objectives?
(If so, what were they?)

WHAT ELSE OCCURRED REGARDING THE PROGRAM, BEFORE IT WAS ESTABLISHED?

What was done? (staff identified, target area selected, constituency mobilized, goals selected)
Did the plan change during this period? (problems, conflicts, and how resolved?) How and Why?

IF YOU WERE PLANNING A PROGRAM AGAIN, WHAT KIND OF INFORMATION AND HELP WOULD YOU WANT?

INITIATION PHASE:

WHAT WAS DONE ONCE FUNDING WAS OBTAINED? (first activities, actions, etc.)

PHYSICAL PLANT:

Does the program have its own office?
When was the site selected for the program?
By whom?
Reasons for selection?

ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE:

Staff:

When was the director recruited and hired?
Who selected him, and by what means?
Reasons for selection?
How long did the process take?
What was the director's job initially?
Is it the same now?
 If not, how has the role changed and why?
How close is the staffing pattern to the projected or intended staffing pattern?
How many of the staff (and who) were around when the program was planned?
How many at a later point? When?
How was staff recruited and hired?
 By whom and how?
 How long did it take?
 Reasons for selection.

Board

Is there a board? What kind (advisory or policy-making)?
How was the board selected?
By whom and when?
When did it first meet?
How often since then?
What does it do? (Illustrate some initial activity, current activities, changes over time and reasons why?)

Contact:

How did people get to know about the program? When?
Were you able to identify any aids to implementing the
   program? (organizations, groups, coalitions, influentials)
   When? How were they involved?
Were there any unanticipated problems at that time?
   What were they, when occurred, how solved or why unsolved?
Did the program undergo any changes during this period?
   If so, what, when, why and what happened?

Action Strategies and Action Targets:

At the beginning how did you think you would accomplish your objectives? (Publicity, negotiation, persuasion, confrontation, court action, organizing constituencies, lobbying; case or class or combination of both).
Who decided on this? When? Why?
Have these changed since then? How? Why?

PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION:

What is the nature of your current program?
  Do you provide direct services? What kinds?
  If so, what percentage of total program does this involve?
  When were these first provided?
  How many are served directly now? Initially?
  Have the types of services provided changed over time?
  If so, how, when, and why?
What proportion of program is devoted to your advocacy activities?
What kinds of activities, when were they first implemented and how?
What portion of your program is devoted to organizational maintenance?
  What kinds? (administration, research, fund raising, mobilizing constituencies, etc.)
Are there activities that have not been included above?
  Kinds, etc.
Who makes most of the decisions in the program?
  By what means?
  Illustrations of some of the more important ones currently.
Do you consider the program to be fully operational?
  If not, what still has to be done?
  When will that happen?
Has the program changed since its inception?
  If so, in what way and why?
Have the goals changed?
  How, when, and why?
What have been the major problems faced by the program?
  Were they solved? When? How? anticipated or unanticipated?
What have been the major failures of the program?
Has the program achieved the goals initially specified?
  If not, what are the differences and why have they occurred?
If a group in a neighboring community came to you for advice about how to set up a child advocacy program like yours, what would you tell them?
If you were evaluating a child advocacy program, what criteria would you use to determine how effective a program is?
  How would you apply these criteria to your program?
If you had it to do again, what would you do differently?

4/23/73

D. AN INSTRUMENT FOR DIFFERENTIAL EVALUATION OF COMMUNITY-BASED CHILD ADVOCACY PROJECTS

The following instrument, which is to be tested for use in evaluation of community-based child advocacy projects, involves three classification schemes:

1. Determination of the project's developmental stage (planning, initiation, implementation) at the time studied. Each project will be classified at its most advanced stage of development.

2. Classification of projects as advocacy and non-advocacy projects. Non-advocacy projects will be labeled as such in the phase in which their non-advocacy is identified, and then eliminated from further study.

3. Identification of inditia of possible success or non-success in the project's current stage of development.

For present purposes, this instrument will include the following: Instructions for the rater (how to use the instrument; which material to get and where it may be obtained); inditia for each phase and instructions regarding weighting, where relevant; the rating scales themselves. When the actual instrument is developed for field use, these may be separated.

12

INSTRUMENT FOR DIFFERENTIAL EVALUATION OF COMMUNITY-BASED CHILD ADVOCACY PROJECTS

Dates of Site Visit ____________________

Name of Field Representative ____________________

Name of Project ____________________
Address ____________________
____

Telephone Number ____________________

Name of Project Director ____________________
Date First Employed ____________________

Date of Funding Authorization for Project ____________________
Date when budget period began ____________________
Annual Budget ____________________
Source of Funds ____________________
Name of Auspice or Sponsoring Agency ____________________
Address: ____________________
____

Staff

Category	Number	date hired	date left	date replaced
Administrative				
Supervisory				
Line				
Specialist (describe)				
Consultant (describe)				
Secretarial				
Other (specify)				

I. CLASSIFICATION OF PROJECT INTO DEVELOPMENTAL STAGES

A. Planning: The stage that begins when some individual, group or organization begins to think about and design a child advocacy project, and ends with the preparation of a formal proposal or memorandum, planning document, or a decision indicating that a child advocacy project will be established.

If any of the indicated activities characterizes a project (and no more than one activity of the initiation phase has as yet been completed) it is to be classified in the planning phase.

SOURCE OF DATA: Written proposal (if one exists) and interview with planner, principal investigator or proposal writer.

1. Determination and documentation of a need or problem in the community. Circle all items below that apply and check "Y" if ANY apply:

Y___
N___
NA___

   a. An individual, group, or organization gets an idea for establishing a child advocacy project and decides to do something about it.

   b. A problem or need related to children is identified in the community.

   c. The meaning and implications of child advocacy are explored.

   d. A leader, leadership group, or planner of child advocacy project is identified.

2. Delineation of a specific target community and a target population.

Y___
N___
NA___

3. Participation in planning the project, of a wide range of interest groups in the community. Check "Y" if three or more of the following are circled.
Y___
N___
NA___

a. Participation and involvement of consumers.

b. Participation and involvement of influential lay people.

c. Participation and involvement of experts.

d. Participation and involvement of relevant organizations.

4. Specification of objectives or of goals.
Y___
N___
NA___

5. Selection of targets for intervention, levels of intervention and interventive methods and techniques. Check "Y" if at least one of the following applies (and circle item):
Y___
N___
NA___

a. One or more targets for change are identified.

b. Strategies for achieving objectives are identified or designed..

6. Organizational structure is designed.
Y___
N___
NA___

7. Selection of an auspice (for a new project) or obtaining the support of the existing administrative structure for a new program component.
Y___
N___
NA___

8. Hiring of an expert to prepare a proposal.
Y___
N___
NA___

9. Preparation of a proposal or memorandum by a leader or leadership group.
Y___
N___
NA___

10. Searching for funds. Check "Y" if one or more of the following apply(and circle applicable items):

Y___
N___
NA___

a. Formal and/or informal contacts with funding agencies.

b. Formal submission of proposal to a funding agency.

c. Informal submission of memorandum to higher administration.

B. Initiation: A stage that begins when a project receives funding and/or a specific decision is made to establish the project. It ends when the organization is structured, the program developed (action targets and strategies identified), a constituency mobilized and case or class advocacy is first provided on a regular basis.

If any two or more of the following activities characterize the project (and activities #1 and #2 of the implementation phase do not characterize the project) it is to be classified in the initiation phase.

SOURCE OF DATA: Interviews with Project Director and Principal Investigator (Indicate which was source of data). Written Progress Reports.

1. Initiation process is begun. Check "Y" if any of the following apply (and circle applicable items):

Y___
N___
NA___

a. Funding is obtained.

b. Administrative approval is obtained.

c. A decision is made to establish a project without formal funding.

2. An organizational structure is established. Check "Y" if a or b apply:

Y
N___
NA___

   a. For projects depending upon the use of paid staff, administrative, supervisory and line staff are recruited and hired.

   b. For projects depending upon the use of volunteer staff, volunteers are recruited and hired.

3. The organizational mission is integrated into the project. Check "Y" only if a and b apply:

Y
N___
NA___

   a. Directors or project leaders are selected from among those who had participated in planning the project.

   b. Staff is trained.

4. Sanction and legitimacy for the project is obtained by the identification, organization, and mobilization of a constituency. Check "Y" if four or more of the following are circled:

Y
N___
NA___

   a. Indigenous staff are recruited and hired.

   b. Membership on the board is defined to include consumers, experts, influential lay people, organizational representatives, others (specify).

   c. Consumers participate in developing the program.

   d. Experts participate in developing the program.

   e. Other organizations participate in developing the program.

   f. Others (specify) participate in developing the program.

5. Specification of goals, in particular first targets for intervention and first interventive strategies. Check "Y" only if all apply:

Y___
N___
NA___

   a. Clientele Contacted.

   b. Referral Sources Contacted.

   c. Target(s) Contacted.

   d. Project Publicized.

6. Beginning provision of services. Check "Y" if any of the following apply (and circle applicable items):

Y___
N___
NA___

   a. Direct services are provided (counseling, tutoring, day care, homemaker)

   b. Access services are provided (information, referral, follow-up, brokerage).

   c. A survey or other form of information gathering is begun.

   d. Case advocacy is provided. (case advocacy is defined; obtaining, assuring, changing and/or improving services, benefits, rights, attention to a specific child, children or family)

   e. Class advocacy is provided. (Class advocacy is defined as obtaining, assuring, changing and/or improving services, benefits, or rights or attention for groups or classes of children and/or their families)

C. Implementation: The implementation phase begins when case or class advocacy is first provided and ends when projects are fully operational, that is, when advocacy activities represent a major portion of the program and a major portion of staff time and objectives are defined in measurable terms. If items #1 or #2 plus at least one other of the following activities characterize the project, it is in the implementation phase.

SOURCE OF DATA: Interviews with Principal Investigator and Project Director. (Indicate which of these provided data if this varies) Written Progress Reports.

1. Regular and frequent provision of case advocacy. (See above for definition) At least one case advocacy action per week for six months.
   Y___
   N___
   NA___

2. Regular and frequent provision of class advocacy. (See above for definition) At least one class advocacy activity per month for six months.
   Y___
   N___
   NA___

3. The sanction for advocacy is strengthened and expanded. Check "Y" if either of the following applies (and circle applicable item):
   Y___
   N___
   NA___

   a. Coalitions are formed with other organizations and groups.

   b. Continued participation of consumers and experts in program and policy development.

4. Effective and efficient use of project energy. Check "Y" if either of the following applies(and circle applicable item).
   Y___
   N___
   NA___

   a. Project concentrates primarily on the provision of advocacy activities.

   b. Project has limited the number and dispersion of targets addressed and strategies employed. (Indicate number and category of target________________________)

5. Continued, but revised and refined, training of staff. (Indicate date of most recent training program: ________________)
   Y___
   N___
   NA___

6. Identification, development and use of several devices to ensure consumer and community accountability. Check "Y" if two or more of the following apply (and circle applicable items):
   Y___
   N___
   NA___

   a. Increased participation of board in making policy for project (when board is representative of consumers in community).

   b. Regular and active participation of board (at least once a month).

   c. Consumer involvement in evaluation of project's achievements.

7. Beginning efforts at project replication.
Y___
N___
NA___

8. Specificity of goals and objectives in measurable terms.
Y___
N___
NA___

9. Documentation of achievements.
Y___
N___
NA___

OVER-ALL CLASSIFICATION OF PROJECT BY STAGE:

This project is now in the: Planning______________ Stage.

Initiation____________ Stage.

Implementation________ Stage.

4/23/73

II. CLASSIFICATION OF PROJECT AS ADVOCACY OR NON-ADVOCACY

A. For projects only at the planning stage use the following criteria:

SOURCES FOR DATA ARE: A written proposal, memorandum, or other planning document and an interview with the principal investigator, planner, project developer or project director.

1. No use of the term "child" or "family advocacy".
Y___
N___
NA___

2. Use of one of the above terms but no definition of it.
Y___
N___
NA___

3. Inappropriate or incorrect use of one of the terms. For example: to describe traditional service roles or direct services such as counseling, child care, child protective services. This is in contrast to appropriate use of the term advocacy to mean: active intervention on behalf of children in relation to those services and institutions which impinge on their lives.
Y___
N___
NA___

4. No objectives specified related to child advocacy. (i.e. above definition).
Y___
N___
NA___

5. No indication that any of the planners defined the project as a child advocacy project.
Y___
N___
NA___

RATING: If two or more "Y's" are characteristic of the planning phase, project was not planned as a child advocacy project.

Project was planned as a child advocacy project.
Y___
N___
NA___

B. For Projects at the Initiation Phase, Use the Following Criteria:

SOURCE OF DATA: Interview with the project director.

1. Project director ignorant of the meaning of child advocacy or its relevance for the project.

   Y___
   N___
   NA___

2. Part of the program designed around child advocacy is eliminated. For example, elimination of specific advocacy training programs; elimination of objectives related to child advocacy.

   Y___
   N___
   NA___

3. No special training for advocate staff and no specified advocacy objectives.

   Y___
   N___
   NA___

RATING: If any of the above are checked "Yes", project was not initiated as a child advocacy project.

Project was initiated as a child advocacy project.

Y___
N___
Other(specify)___

III. RATING OF PROJECT AT CURRENT STAGE OF DEVELOPMENT

A. For Projects only at the planning stage, use the following criteria:

SOURCE OF DATA: Interviews with planner or principal investigator; separate and additional interview with project director (if possible)

1. Planning begun by other than individual initiative(s). Check "Y" if response is other than a:

Y__
N__
NA__

   a. Someone heard about child advocacy or specific problems and decided to plan a child advocacy project.

   b. Someone heard about funds being available for child advocacy projects and decided to plan a project.

   c. An organization heard about child advocacy and decided to plan a project.

   d. An organization heard about funds being available for child advocacy projects and decided to plan a project.

   e. Other (describe)________________________________
   ____

VALIDATING DATA FOR ABOVE

When did planning first begin? Year________ Month__________

Who planned project? (List names and positions of people at the time of planning who helped plan the project):

When did planners first learn of funding agency's interest in child advocacy projects? Year__________ Month___________

SOURCE OF DATA FOR #2 BELOW: Interviews with planner or principal investigator: Separate interview with project director; interview with staff members.

2. Need for child advocacy not widely recognized or accepted in the community. Check "Y" for any of the following responses: a (2), b, or c: Y__ N__ NA__

   a. Planner first learned of child advocacy from:
      1) Joint Commission Report
      2) Funding Agency Notification
      3) Newspaper Article
      4) Other Practitioners
      5) Other Child Advocacy Projects
      6) Other (specify)________________________________

   b. Project director first learned of child advocacy after being hired.

   c. Staff first learned of child advocacy after being hired.

SOURCE OF DATA FOR #3 BELOW: Reading of proposal and related documents; interviews with planner or principal investigator and project director.

3. Project poorly designed. Check "Y" if any two of the following apply (and circle applicable items): Y__ N__ NA__

   a. Community problems, needs or objectives not clearly defined (any one of the following).

      1. Problem defined as lack of resources but no specificity as to type of resource (e.g. provision of services in community, special services or institutions, expanded services).

      2. Problem defined as poor quality services but no specificity. (e.g. more staff)

      3. Problem defined as unresponsive service system but no specificity. (e.g. need for changed policies and procedures)

      4. Problem defined as low priority placed on children's needs but no clarity as to what needs should be highlighted.

      5. Other (specify)________________________________

b. Target population and target community are fragmented and disparate and there are no strategies specified to overcome this problem during the planning phase.

c. Child advocacy defined in general and diffuse terms.

d. No conceptual framework developed.

VALIDATING DATA FOR "d" ABOVE

Please circle whichever of the following characterize the project and indicate basis for conclusion.

1) Internal advocacy - changing the system in which the project is based.

2) External advocacy - changing other systems that serve children and acting as spokesmen for child with regard to that system.

3) Monitoring or regulating - ensuring that services provided are what service systems or institutions are supposed to provide.

4) Lay advocacy

5) Legal advocacy

6) Combination of lay and legal advocacy

7) Other (describe)____

SOURCE OF DATA FOR #4 BELOW: Interviews with the planner, project director and two of each of groups specified (consumers, lay people, experts, organizations)

4. Failure to involve all facets of the relevant community in planning for the child advocacy project. Check "Y" unless at least three of the following are circled:

Y____
N____
NA____

a. Participation of consumers in planning.

VALIDATING DATA

Who?: (names and addresses of three consumers):

____
____
____

How?: Membership in planning group____
Meetings____
Workshops____
Surveys (personal, mail, telephone)____
Other (specify)______________________________
____

When?: (Frequency of Involvement)
Once during the planning phase____
Two to three times____
Four or more times____

What was the nature of this participation? (Briefly describe up to four activities of consumers):

____
____
____
____

b. Participation of influential lay people in planning.

VALIDATING DATA

Who?: (names and addresses of three influential lay people):

____
____
____

How?: Membership in planning group____
Meetings____
Workshops____
Surveys (personal, mail, telephone)____
Other (specify)______________________________________
____

When?: (Frequency of Involvement)
Once during the planning phase____
Two to three times____
Four or more times____

What was the nature of this participation? (Briefly describe up to four activities of influential lay people):

____
____
____
____

c. Participation of experts in planning

VALIDATING DATA

Who?: (names and addresses of three experts)

____
____
____

How?: Membership in planning group____
Meetings____
Workshops____
Surveys (personal, mail, telephone)____
Other (specify)____
____

When?: (Frequency of Involvement)
Once in the planning phase____
Two to three times____
Four or more times____

What was the nature of this participation? (Briefly describe up to four activities of experts)

____
____
____

d. Participation of relevant organizations in planning.

VALIDATING DATA

Who?: (names addresses and type of organization)

____

____

____

How?: Representation through membership in planning group____
Meetings____
Workshops____
Survey____
Other (specify)______________________________

When?: (Frequency of Involvement)
Once during the planning phase____
Two to three times____
Four or more times____

What was the nature of this participation? (Briefly describe up to four activities of relevant organizations)

____

____

____

____

____

____

SOURCE OF DATA FOR #5 BELOW: Interview with administrative director of over-all project or agency and with immediate supervisor of director of advocacy component.

5. (For new components of existing programs only) Failure to obtain administrative support for new component. Check "Y" if a below is "no":
Y__
N__
NA__

a. Did the project get administrative support and commitment for planning the new program component?: Y__ N__

SOURCE OF DATA FOR #6 BELOW: Interview with planner, principal investigator, or project director if others are unavailable.

6. Proposal prepared by someone not actively involved with the planning of the project.

Y__
N__
NA__

VALIDATING DATA

Nature of relationship(s) of individual who prepared proposal to project and other planners:

1) One of planners____
2) Staff or board member of sponsoring agency____
3) Board member of over-all project____
4) Other (specify)____

4/23/73

III. RATING OF PROJECT AT CURRENT STAGE OF DEVELOPMENT

B. For projects at the initiation phase, use the following criteria:

SOURCE OF DATA FOR #'s 1a and 1d BELOW: Interviews with project director and principal investigator or planner

SOURCE OF DATA FOR #1c BELOW: Interviews with principal investigator or planner, project director and two representatives of each of the above four groups.

SOURCE OF DATA FOR #1d BELOW: Interviews with principal investigator, planner, project director and supervisor(s) or advocates.

1. Project poorly structured. Check "Y" if either a,b, or c below is circled:

Y__
N__
NA__

a. The project director was not involved in planning the project.

b. There was no special training program for the advocate staff.

c. Failure to involve all facets of the relevant community. (Circle c unless three out of the four below are circled):

1) Consumers involved

(See page 21 for VALIDATING DATA)

VALIDATING DATA FOR "III.-B.-1.-c.-1)"

Who?: (names and addresses of three consumers)

How?: Community Meetings____
Board Members____
Staff Members____
Other Consultants (specify)____

When?: (Frequency of Involvement)
Weekly____
Monthly____
Three to four times____
Once or Twice____
Ongoing part of program____
ad hoc basis____

What was the nature of consumer participation? (Illustrate):

2) Experts involved

VALIDATING DATA

Who?: (names and addresses of experts involved)

How?: Community Meetings____
Board____
Staff____
Consultants____
Other (specify)____

When?: (Frequency of Involvement):
Weekly____
Monthly____
3-4 times____
1-2 times____
Ongoing part of program____
ad hoc basis____

What was the nature of expert participation? (Illustrate):

3) Lay people involved

VALIDATING DATA

Who?: (names and addresses of lay people involved)

How?: Meetings____
Board____
Volunteers____
Other (specify)____

When?: (Frequency of Involvement): Same as Above

What was the nature of lay participation? (illustrate): Same as Above

4) Other relevant organizations

VALIDATING DATA

Who?: (names of three agencies)

____

____

____

How?: Informal Personal Contacts____
Representation on Board____
Meetings____
Workshops____
Formally established linkages (specify)____
Other (specify)____

When?: (Frequency of Involvement)
Weekly____
Monthly____
Three to four times____
Once or Twice____
Ongoing part of program____
ad hoc basis____

What was the nature of the participation of relevant organizations?
(Illustrate types of activities)

____

____

____

____

____

____

d. No further specification of objectives, advocacy targets, advocacy strategies.

VALIDATING DATA

What are the current objectives of the project?

What are the first targets for change?: School____
Juvenile Court____
Other (specify)____

What are the first strategies identified for implementing change?:

SOURCE OF DATA FOR #2 BELOW: Interviews with principal investigator or planner, project director, and two staff members, two board members and chairman of the board.

2. Project's current experience characterized by the existence of numerous or extensive intra-organizational conflicts which significantly affect the work of the project.

Y___
N___
NA___

VALIDATING DATA

If response is yes to above question, specify the basis for this conclusion:

____

____

____

____

SOURCE OF DATA FOR #'s 3,4, and 5: Interviews with project director and staff.

3. Inappropriate selection of targets. Check "Y" if either a or b applies:

Y___
N___
NA___

a. Target defined as city-wide or larger service system.

b. Project providing class advocacy identifies three or more targets (e.g. school, juvenile justice system, health services, public welfare system).

4. Strategies selected that are inappropriate to target.

Y___
N___
NA___

(see next page for VALIDATING DATA)

VALIDATING DATA

What are the targets the project is trying to change?

1) Individual case____
2) Individual school____
3) Individual agency (specify)____
4) Individual policy (specify)____
5) Individual procedure (specify)____
6) Budget____
7) School system____
8) Legislation (specify)____
9) Justice system____
10) Health services (specify)____
11) Other (specify)____
12) None____

What strategies is the project using to implement change in these targets?:

1) Fact finding and documentation____
2) Negotiation____
3) Persuasion____
4) Mass Publicity____
5) Court Action____
6) Organization of Coalitions____
7) Lobbying____
8) Public Demonstration____
9) Other (specify)____

(Targets #'s 7,8,9,10 and any other major target require the use of at least five of the above strategies. Case advocacy may be achieved through the use of strategies 1-5; 6-8 are inappropriate. Class advocacy may be achieved through the use of any 5 or more of these strategies)

5. Staff without skills to achieve goals or implement strategies and no adequate provision of training program to compensate for this. Y__ N__ NA__

VALIDATING DATA

SOURCE OF DATA: Interview with project director and staff.

If there was a special training program for the advocate staff, when did first training begin? (day, month, year):____

When did training end? (day, month, year):____

What was included in training? (specify):____

SOURCE OF DATA FOR #6 BELOW: Interview with project director.

6. Use of crash programming approach.

Y__
N__
NA__

VALIDATING DATA

How long did it take for the program to develop its regular program activities or provide services regularly?:

1) Less than six months____
2) More than six months____
3) More than eight but less than twelve months____
4) Other (specify)____

SOURCE OF DATA FOR #7 BELOW: Interviews with project director, staff and direct observation.

7. Absence of case or class advocacy. Check "Y" if neither a nor b apply:

Y__
N__
NA__

a. Project provides case advocacy (more than three instances).

VALIDATING DATA

Give four examples:____

b. Project provides class advocacy (at least one instance).

VALIDATING DATA

Give three examples:____

C. For projects at the implementation phase: Use the following tentative criteria:

SOURCE OF DATA FOR #'s 1,2, and 3: Interviews with project director, several staff members and some observation.

1. Case advocacy is provided regularly, meaning a minimum average of one case advocacy situation per relevant staff member per week.

Y_
N_
NA_

(Part-time staff or volunteer workers' time should be converted into full-time equivalents. e.g. Thirty-five hours of work=one work week= one case advocacy situation.)

VALIDATING DATA

Quantity: Number of advocacy cases handled last month____
Number of advocacy cases handled last year_____

Illustrate: Provide four examples and specify when they occurred.

2. Class advocacy is provided regularly meaning a minimum of six class advocacy situations during the past six months. These may be either class action suits, policy changes affecting a whole school or institution

Y__
N__
NA__

VALIDATING DATA

Illustrate (provide four examples and specify when they occurred):

3. More than 50% of the staff time goes to the provision of advocacy activities.

Y___
N___
NA___

VALIDATING DATA

Staff divide their time each day as follows:

____% Providing information, referral and brokerage services.
____% Counseling or other direct services.
____% Report Writing.
____% Survey or collecting information.
____% Administrative duties (specify)______________________________
____% Attending intra-agency meetings.
____% Attending meetings outside of agency.
____% Case advocacy.
____% Class advocacy.

4. Has the project formed formal coalitions with other groups or organizations?

Y___
N___
NA___

VALIDATING DATA

If yes, give names, addresses, types of organizations as well as names of coalition groups and dates formed.

5. Has the project been replicated elsewhere?

Y___
N___
NA___

VALIDATING DATA

If yes, where?:____

when (date)?:____

6. Does the project have a formal self-evaluation process?

Y___
N___
NA___

VALIDATING DATA

If yes, obtain written report.

7. Is staff training a regular, ongoing part of the program?

Y___
N___
NA___

VALIDATING DATA

How frequently is training program provided?:____________________

What is date of most recent program?:_________________________

IV. RATING SUMMARY

		Check as Scored	
Planning Phase	Y	N	NA
Item #1			
2			
3			
4			
5			
6			
Score Total			

		Check as Scored	
Initiation Phase	Y	N	NA
Item #1			
2			
3			
4			
5			
6			
7			
Score Total			

Check as Scored

Implementation Phase		Y	N	NA
	Item # 1			
	2			
	3			
	4			
	5			
	6			
	7			
Score Total:		___	___	___

Score Summation - Indicia of Difficulty

Planning (Y)________________

Initiation (Y)________________

Implementation (N)_____________

Final Score____

V. Rating Summary

Planning Phase

4 or more indicia of difficulty have been checked Y____

fewer than 4 checked Y____

Initiation Phase

5 or more indicia of difficulty have been checked Y____

fewer than 5 indicia have been checked Y____

Both Phases Together: (Implementation Prediction Capacity)

9 or more indicia of difficulty have been checked Y____

fewer than 5 indicia have been checked Y____

Predictive Probability for Implementation

Prediction Accurate____

Prediction Inaccurate____

E. MEMORANDUM TO FIELD REPRESENTATIVES

April 25, 1973

TO: Field Representatives

FROM: S. B. Kamerman

RE: Instructions for Field Visits

I. To Classify Projects at Current Stage of Development:

A. Interview (separately) Principal Investigators, Project Director and 2 staff members, regarding current project activities.

Major Focus of Interview to be:

1. What is going on now in the program?
2. What is staff doing now and what have they been doing for the past 6 months (for each category of staff: administrative, supervisory, line)?
3. What are project's current goals, objectives, purposes? Achieved how? (Direct services, access, planning, research, case and/or class advocacy)
4. For all the above, obtain detailed illustrations and examples; frequency of activities.

B. Obtain appropriate written material as indicated in the instrument.

C. Dictate or write a full narrative summary as well as filling in the instrument. Where different responses are given to the questions (e.g., director and staff view project goals or staff roles differently) indicate this. When filling in an instrument be sure to complete all items referring to validating data and note fully on form or elsewhere, your reasons for response or conclusions, and any related comments.

II. Classification of Advocacy and Non-Advocacy Projects

Although by official definition all the projects you visit are child advocacy programs and met our criteria when originally classified, there may have been changes. Therefore, please comment on how you perceive their concept of child advocacy and any difference you note between the projects you visit as to concept and practice of advocacy. If they are now mis-classified, please indicate.

III. Rate projects for current developmental stage ONLY

A. Since by definition no project you visit is in the planning stage, the critical issue here is to be clear whether a project is in the initiation or the implementation phase (or is fully implemented).

Thus, for Part III, only B or C will be filled out.

B. This instrument requires interviews with staff, Board members and clients as well as Project Directors and Principle Investigator.

IV. A. In general, at the beginning of each interview be certain that you explain the purpose of the study and assure complete confidentiality to each interviewee and to the project generally.

B. Indicate independence of this project from federal funding agencies. We are not part of the federal evaluation or funding machinery.

C. Do not use terms such as "case," "class" or "advocacy" until the terms have been used by interviewees - or until activities which meet our definition of case and/or class advocacy have been described.

D. Feel free to telephone me at the end of the first day (or at any other point during your visit if there are things you want to discuss).

Office Telephone Number 280-4273
348-2505 or
348-3476

SBK:wht

F. INTERVIEW SCHEDULE FOR PROJECT DIRECTOR AND FOR PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR

INTRODUCTORY STATEMENT

(Statement to be developed covering explanations to interviewees re purposes and auspices of study, appropriate confidentiality, etc.)

IDENTIFYING INFORMATION

PROJECT NAME____

PROJECT ADDRESS______________________________________

INTERVIEWEE NAME_____________________________________

INTERVIEWEE TITLE____________________________________

INTERVIEWEE TELEPHONE________________________________

DATE OF INTERVIEW____________________________________

TIME OF INTERVIEW: BEGAN______________ ENDED_____________

INTERVIEWER NAME_____________________________________

F. EXCERPTS FROM INTERVIEW SCHEDULE FOR PROJECT DIRECTOR AND PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR

(supplementary project)

Now I'd like to get an idea of what the goals or purposes or objectives of your project are.

5. What are the real things you are trying to accomplish?

   (Interviewer: Probe for definition of any terms...what do you mean by..? Do not introduce any terms or definitions not supplied by respondent. Probe until goal statements are identified.)

GOAL STATEMENTS

....

5A. Let me read back the goals you have identified. Are these what you had in mind? (Revise if indicated)

5B. Now, would you tell me which you regard as of primary importance, next in importance, third in importance and so on? (Interviewer record as follows:

Goal of Primary Importance: ____________________

____

Goal Next in Importance: ____________________

____

Goal Third in Importance: ____________________

____

Other Goal(s): ____________________

____

(If respondent considers some goals as equally important, note this.)

6. May we move to some statistical information on the different types of staff activity carried on in the past 3 months? You may wish to refer to statistical reports.

(Interviewer: If there is no activity reported in an area, write none and go on to the next)

A1. How many different clients (individuals or families, as counted by the agency) were provided with direct case service by your staff. (For example, counseling, tutoring, information, escort services, referral services, etc. for clients) __________

A3. What do you estimate is the percentage of total staff time given to this activity? __________%

B1. How many contacts were made with personnel (other than your own agency staff) to get more or better service or to change the way individual clients were dealt with or to assure implementation of entitlements for individual clients or families. __________

(Interviewer: In B2 and C2, the purpose is to see whether the respondent is answering the statistical questions with the same framework in mind as the interviewer. Pick up examples which do not fit the framework, and revise the responses, if necessary. For example, B2 question is aimed at case advocacy. If the examples are class advocacy, the number of actions and percent of man hours allocated properly belong in C2. The reverse is true for C2, where the examples may really belong in B2.)

B2. What kinds of agencies, organizations or officials or groups were contacted for what purposes?

Agency, organization, group or official(s) (Type):	Purposes:
Agency, organization, group or official(s) (Type):	Purposes:
Agency, organization, group or official(s) (Type):	Purposes:
Agency, organization, group or official(s) (Type):	Purposes:
Agency, organization, group or official(s) (Type):	Purposes:

B3. What do you estimate is the percentage of total staff time given to this activity? ________%

C1. How many contacts were made with personnel (other than your own agency staff) to discuss changes on behalf of groups or classes of clients? (For example, changes in programs, policies, laws, budgets, intake or other policies, quality or level of concrete or counseling services, structural arrangements, etc.)

C2. What kinds of agencies, organizations, officials, groups were contacted for what kinds of changes on behalf of groups or classes of clients?

Agency, organization, group or official(s) (Type):	Purposes:
Agency, organization, group or official(s) (Type):	Purposes:
Agency, organization, group or official(s) (Type):	Purposes:
Agency, organization, group or official(s) (Type):	Purposes:
Agency, organization, group or official(s) (Type):	Purposes:

C3. What do you estimate is the percentage of total staff time given to this activity? ________%

D1. How many different legal actions developed on behalf of individual clients? ________%

D2. What were the legal issues involved?

____
____
____
____
____

D3. What do you estimate is the percentage of total staff time devoted to this activity? ________%

E1. How many different legal actions were developed on behalf of groups or classes of clients? ________

E2. What were the legal issues involved?

____
____
____
____
____

E3. What do you estimate is the total percentage of staff time devoted to this activity? ________%

F1. How many different kinds of community work (for example, participation in community planning or coordination of services, community education, self-help development, etc.) did your project engage in? ________

F2. What are the kinds of community work you actually engaged in for what purposes?

Kind of Community work:	Purposes:
Kind of Community work:	Purposes:
Kind of Community work:	Purposes:
Kind of Community work:	Purposes:
Kind of Community work:	Purposes:

F3. What do you estimate is the percentage of total staff time devoted to this activity? __________

G1. Are there any other significant types of activities not covered above which should be noted? If so, what is it?:

____

G3. What do you estimate is the percentage of total staff time devoted to this other activity? __________%

(Interviewer: Add up all the percentages. If the total exceeds 100, go over these again with respondent. If the total is under 100, do not review.)

(Interviewer, please note:

____Project Director estimates figures from memory.
____Project Director uses figures from statistical reports.
____Other - Specify:_______________________________________)

....

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adams, Richard N. and Preiss, Jack J., eds. *Human Organization Research: Field Relations and Techniques.* Homewood, Ill.: Dorsey Press, 1960.

Amidon, Arlene and Brim, Orville, Jr. *Policy and Evaluation Research on Child Care Programs.* Memorandum prepared for the Advisory Committee on Child Development. National Research Council - National Academy of Science, 1972 (Mimeographed).

Barr, Sherman. "Some Observations on the Practice of Indigenous Non-Professional Workers." *Personnel in Anti-Poverty Programs: Implications for Social Work Education.* New York: Council on Social Work Education, 1967, pp. 51-62.

Bennis, Warren G. *Changing Organizations: Essays on the Development and Evolution of Human Organization.* New York: McGraw-Hill, 1966.

Brager, George A. "Advocacy and Political Behavior." *Social Work*, XIII:2 (April 1968) 5-15.

————————. "Institutional Change: Perimeters of the Possible." *Social Work*, XII:1 (January 1967) 59-69.

———————— and Purcell, Francis P., eds. *Community Action Against Poverty.* New Haven, Conn.: College and University Press, 1967.

———————— and Specht, Harry. *Community Organizing.* New York: Columbia University Press, 1973.

Briar, Scott. "The Current Crisis in Social Casework." *Social Work Practice.* Selected papers from the 94th Annual Forum of the National Conference on Social Welfare. New York: Columbia University Press, 1967.

————————. "The Social Worker's Responsibility for the Civil Rights of Clients." *New Perspectives: The Berkeley Journal of Social Welfare* (Spring 1967) 88-92.

Bruce, Robert G. "What Goes Wrong With Education." Human Needs, 1(1):(July 1972) 10-11.

Cahn, Edgar S. and Jean Camper. "War on Poverty: A Civilian Perspective." Yale Law Journal, LXXIII:8 (July 1964) 1316-1341.

Campbell, Donald T. "Considering the Case Against Experimental Evaluations of Social Innovations." Administrative Quarterly, 15 (1) (January 1970) 110-113.

Caro, Francis G. Readings in Evaluation Research. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1971.

Cohen, David K., et. al. Consumer Protection in Public Education. Cambridge, Mass.: Center for the Study of Public Policy, 1971 (Mimeographed).

Cohen, Jerome. "Advocacy and the Children's Crisis." American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, XLI:5, (October 1971) 807-808.

Cohen, Stanley and Taylor, Laurie. Psychological Survival: The Experience of Longterm Imprisonment. New York: Pantheon Books, 1972.

Coughlin, Bernard J. "The Rights of Children." Child Welfare, XLVII:3 (March 1968) 133-142.

Cox, Fred M., et. al., eds. Strategies of Community Organization: A Book of Readings. Itasca, Ill.: F. E. Peacock Publishers, Inc., 1970.

Crisis in Child Mental Health: Challenge for the 1970s. Report of the Joint Commission on Mental Health of Children. New York: Harper and Row, 1970.

Encyclopedia of Social Work (16th Issue). Edited by Robert Morris. New York: National Association of Social Workers, 1971.

Fellin, Phillip and Litwak, Eugene. "The Neighborhood in Urban American Society." Social Work, XIII:3 (July 1968) 72-80.

Ferman, Louis A. "Social Perspectives on Evaluating Social Welfare Programs." The Annals of the American Academy, CCCLXXXV (September 1969).

Filstead, William J., ed. Qualitative Methodology: First Hand Involvement with the Social World. Chicago: Markham Publishing Co., 1970.

A Foundation Goes to School: The Ford Foundation School Improvement Program, 1960-1970. New York: The Ford Foundation, 1972.

Freeman, Howard E. and Sherwood, Clarence C. *Social Research and Social Policy*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1970.

Gilbert, Neil; Rosenkranz, Armin and Specht, Harry. "Dialectics of Social Planning." *Social Work*, XVIII:2 (March 1973) 78-86.

Glaser, Barney G. and Strauss, Anselm L. *The Discovery of Grounded Theory: Strategies for Qualitative Research*. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Co., 1967.

Glazer, Myron. *The Research Adventure: Promise and Problems of Field Work*. New York: Random House, 1972.

Goldberg, Gertrude S. "Non-Professionals in Human Services." *Non-Professionals in the Human Services*. Edited by Charles Grosser, William E. Henry and James G. Kelly. San Francisco: Jossey-Boss, Inc., 1969, pp. 12-39.

Gould, Richard J. "Children's Rights: More Liberal Games." *Social Policy*, I:7 (July-August 1971) 50-52.

Grosser, Charles. "Community Development Programs Serving the Urban Poor." *Social Work*, X:3 (July 1965) 15-21.

_______________. *Helping Youth: A Study of Six Community Organization Programs*. Washington, D. C.: U.S. Dept. of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1968.

Hage, Jerold and Aiken, Michael. *Social Change in Complex Organizations*. New York: Random House, 1970.

Hearing Before the Committee on Finance, U. S. Senate. "Establishing Priorities Among Programs Aiding the Poor." Washington, D. C. : U. S. Government Printing Office, 1972.

Hyman, Herbert H.; Wright, Charles R. and Hopkins, Terence K. *Applications of Methods of Evaluation*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1962.

Kahn, Alfred J. *Studies in Social Policy and Planning*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1969.

_______________. *Theory and Practice of Social Planning*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1969.

__________; Kamerman, Sheila B. and McGowan, Brenda G. *Child Advocacy: Report of a National Baseline Study*. Washingtn, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1973.

Katz, Daniel and Kahn, Robert L. *The Social Psychology of Organizations*. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1966.

Kirschner Associates, Inc. *A Description and Evaluation of Advocacy Planning Projects* (Prepared for Office of Economic Opportunity, Contract No. B89-4558). Albuquerque, New Mexico, January 1971.

Knitzer, Jane. "Advocacy and the Children's Crisis." *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, XLI:5 (October 1971) 799-806.

Kohler, Mary. "The Rights of Children: An Unexplored Constituency." *Social Policy*, I:6 (March-April 1971) 34-44.

Kramer, Ralph M. *Participation of the Poor: Comparative Community Case Studies in the War on Poverty*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1969.

Lawrence, Paul R. and Lorsch, Jay W. *Developing Organizations: Diagnosis and Action*. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co., 1969.

Levine, Abraham S. "Evaluating Program Effectiveness and Efficiency." *Welfare in Review*, V:2 (February 1967) 1-11.

Levine, Robert A. "Evaluating the War on Poverty." *On Fighting Poverty: Perspectives from Experience*. Edited by James L. Sundquist. New York: Basic Books, 1969, pp. 188-216.

Levitan, Sar A. and Taggart, Robert. *Social Experimentation and Manpower Policy: Rhetoric and Reality*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1971.

Lewis, Wilbert L. "Child Advocacy and Ecological Planning." *Mental Hygiene*, LIV:4 (October 1970) 475-483.

Litwak, Eugene. "An Approach to Linkage in 'Grass Roots' Community Organization." *Strategies of Community Organization*. Edited by Fred M. Cox, et. al. Itasca, Ill.: F. E. Peacock Publishing,Inc., 1970, pp. 126-138.

Litwak, Eugene and Meyer, Henry J. "The Administrative Style of the School and Organizational Tasks." *Strategies of Community Organization*. Edited by Fred M. Cox, et. al. Itasca, Ill.: F. E. Peacock Publishing, Inc., 1970, pp. 78-90.

______________________________. "A Balance Theory of Coordination Between Bureaucratic Organizations and Community Primary Groups." *Behavioral Science for Social Workers*. Edited by Edwin J. Thomas. New York: The Free Press, 1967.

McCall, George J. and Simmons, J. C. *Issues in Participant Observation*. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co., 1969.

March, James G. *Handbook of Organizations*. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1965.

Marris, Peter and Rein, Martin. *Dilemmas of Social Reform: Poverty and Community Action in the United States*. New York: Atherton Press, 1967.

Morris, Robert and Binstock, Robert H. "Decisions Confronting a Planning Specialist." *Social Service Review*, XL:1 (March 1966) 8-14.

O'Donnell, Edward J. "An Organizational Twiggy: A Review of Neighborhood Service Centers." *Welfare in Review*, V:8 (1967) 6-11.

________________. "The Neighborhood Service Center: A Place to Go and a Place to be From." *Welfare in Review*, VI:1 (1968) 11-21.

________________, and Reid, Otto M. "The Multi-Service Neighborhood Center: Preliminary Findings from a National Survey." *Welfare in Review*, IX:3 (May-June 1971) 1-8.

________________ and Sullivan, Marilyn M. "Service Delivery and Social Action Through the Neighborhood Center: A Review of Research." *Welfare in Review*, VII:9 (November-December 1969) 1-12.

Perlman, Robert and Jones, David. *Neighborhood Service Centers*. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Dept. of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1967.

Perrow, Charles. "A Framework for the Comparative Analysis of Organizations." *American Sociological Review*, XXXII:2 (April 1967) 194-208.

President's Task Force on Early Child Development, J. McV. Hunt, Chairman. "A Bill of Rights for Children." Washington, D. C.: Office of the Secretary, Department of Health, Education and Welfare, 1967.

Rein, Martin and Miller, S. M. "The Demonstration Project as a Strategy of Change." *Organizing for Community Welfare*. Edited by Mayer N. Zald. Chicago: Quadrangle Books, 1967, pp. 160-191.

Rivlin, Alice M. *Systematic Thinking for Social Action*. Washington, D. C.: The Brookings Institution, 1971.

Rossi, Peter H. "Practice, Method, and Theory in Evaluating Social Action Programs." *On Fighting Poverty: Perspectives from Experience*. Edited by James L. Sundquist. New York: Basic Books, 1969, pp. 217-234.

Rossi, Peter H. and Williams, Walter, eds. *Evaluating Social Programs: Theory, Practice and Politics*. New York: Seminar Press, 1972.

Russell Sage Foundation Annual Report, 1970-1971. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1971.

Sarason, Seymour B. *The Creation of Settings and the Future Societies*. San Francisoo: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1972.

Sherwood, Clarence C. "Measuring Social Action Programs." *Welfare in Review*, V:7 (August-September 1967) 13-18.

Shmeltzer, June L., ed. *Learning in Action*. Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1966.

Smith, Rebecca. "For Every Child...A Commentary on Developments in Child Welfare." *Child Welfare*, XLVII:3 (March 1968) 125-132.

Spergel, Irving A. "Community-Based Delinquency Prevention Programs: An Overview." *Social Service Review*, XLVII:1 (March 1973) 16-31.

Suchman, Edward A. *Evaluative Research*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1967.

Sundquist, James L. *On Fighting Poverty: Perspectives from Experience*. New York: Basic Books, 1969.

Thompson, James D. *Organizations in Action: Social Science Bases*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1967.

Tripodi, Tony; Fellin, Phillip and Epstein, Irwin. *Social Program Evaluation: Guidelines for Health, Education, and Welfare Administrators.* Itasca, Ill.: F. E. Peacock Publishers, 1971.

Vanecko, J. and J. "Community Mobilization and Institutional Change." *Social Science Quarterly*, L:3 (1969).

Warren, Roland L. "The Interorganizational Field as a Focus for Investigation." *Strategies of Community Organization.* Edited by Fred M. Cox, et. al. Itasca, Ill.: F. E. Peacock, Inc., 1970, pp. 139-152.

Weiss, Carol H. *Evaluating Action Programs: Readings in Social Action and Education.* Boston: Allyn & Bacon, Inc., 1972.

______________. *Evaluation Research.* Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1972.

Weiss, Robert S. and Rein, Martin. "The Evaluation of Broad-Aim Programs: Difficulties in Experimental Design and an Alternative." *Evaluating Action Programs.* Edited by Carol H. Weiss. Boston: Allyn & Bacon, Inc., 1972, pp. 236-249.

Wholey, Joseph S., *et. al.* *Federal Evaluation Policy: Analyzing the Effects of Public Programs.* Washington, D. C.: Urban Institute, 1971.

Williams, Walter. *Social Policy Research and Analysis.* New York: American Elsevier Publishing Co., 1971.

Wilson, James Q. "On Pettigrew and Armor: and Afterward." *The Public Interest*, No. 30 (Winter 1973) 132-34.

Wolfsenberger, Wolf. "Toward Citizen Advocacy for the Handicapped." Lincoln, Nebraska: Nebraska Psychiatric Institute, University of Nebraska Medical Center (Mimeographed.) (Undated).

Work, Henry H. "Parent-Child Centers: A Working Reappraisal." *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, XLII:2 (July 1972) 582-595.

Wyatt, C. Jones "Research in Social Work: Planning and Community Organization." *Encyclopedia of Social Work*, pp. 1122-1123.

Zald, Mayer N., ed. *Organizing for Community Welfare.* Chicago: Quadrangle Books, 1967.